

A Second
DISCOURSE
ABOUT
Re-Ordination.
BEING

An Answer to two or three Books come out against
this Subject, in behalf of the many concern'd at
this season; who for the sake of their Ministry,
and upon necessity, do yield to it; in de-
fence of their *Submission*.

By JOHN HUMFREY, *Min.*

TOGETHER,

With his testimony, which from the good hand of the
Lord, is laid upon himself, to bear, in this ge-
neration, against the evil, and to prevent, or
repress (as much as by him may be
possible) the danger, of the
Imposition.

But when I speak with thee, I will open thy mouth, and thou shalt say
unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, he that heareth, let him
bear, and he that forbear, let him forbear, Ex. 3. 27.

Peccavi? sed forsân non sponte. Tu quoq; in multis delinquis. ἄλλος
τοῖς σοῖς &c. Peccavi? Ne hoc quidem satis scis an peccavi? Ut
maximè stomacheris, tamen vita hominum momentanea, ac paulo
post, omnes morimur.

London, Printed for Tho. Williams at the Bible in Little
Britain, and Tho. Johnson at the Golden Key in St.

Pauls Church-yard, 1662.

1662

Reverendis, pijs, & eruditione praestantibus, Ecclesiae Anglicanae Ministris, praecipue vero ijs ad quos haec potissimum spectant, Patribus, Fratribus, & Commilitonibus, sub Christo Duces merentibus, longe charissimis, salutem plurimam.

AD exoptatam toties, & ab omnibus exoptandam, Ecclesiam nostrae felicitatem, ingenerandam, & illasam conservandam (salvo aliorum iudicio) duo quidem apprimè utilia, & maxime accommodata, fore existimo; modo unum a nobis solerter inquiri, alterum a Superioribus per gratiam impetrari, eorundemque benignitate & mandato, in effectum tandem deduci possit. Hoc est, si praeter receptam Ecclesiae visibilibus notionem, aliam nos adeò strictam, tantae verò latitudinis, indagare possemus, ut unionis Ecclesiasticae sit fundamentum: deinde si magis sobrij qui notionem istam concoquere, & parochiales nostras (quas vocant) Ecclesias ferre possunt, ad mutuum inter Presbyterum & Episcopum concordiam componendam, potius quam a causa alicujus partis stare, se totos & ex animo applicarent.

Inter arduas, acerrimas, & validissimas nuperarum & praesentium (proh dolor!) contentionum nostrarum disceptationes & controversias, accipitis Martae urinae agitatae, non minima hic fuit, de subiecta federis externi materia, sive de vera ecclesiae visibilis notionem: quae prout in usu & in more recepta, adeò arcta & angusta est, ut nonnullis rem controversant alijs rumpuntibus, & ad rationis normam accurrat exigentibus, dubitanti ansam dederit, quae ecclesia quas appellant nationales, sint verè ecclesia, & patrocinio digna; in quibus scilicet, omnes, quemadmodum inter Judaeos, quotquot e parentibus Christianis nati, fidei Christianae per Baptisma iniciantur, templa frequentant, concionibus interfunt, pro veteris & geminis habeantur membris.

Theologi nostri communiter ecclesiam per fideliū, sive renatorum ex natura suā ad statum gratiae evocatorum, eorum designant: Visibilem verò ab istius renascentia (sive salvifica fidei & penitentiae) professione denominant. Hanc professionem Congregationales, ambigunt (quod aiunt) ulnis amplectuntur, & in praesidium sibi substruunt, dum sine tali, qua indicto sit hominem salvificā gratia imbutum esse, pro membro neminem admittunt.

admittunt. Professio non propter se requiritur, sed propter professorem ipsum, ut quis, & qualis ipse sit, nobis dicat, & ad hanc professio ejusmodi, scilicet nullius inferioris, sed vere renata fidei (sive gratia,) a Theologis nobis undiq; comprobatur, illi principia suis adhaerere, & serio rem agere videntur, cum in quantum possunt, hoc prospiciunt, ut illi omnes quos in gregem suum recipiunt (usq; quo saltem ecclesia judicium extendi possit) tales reapse sint, quales se esse profitentur; cum vos qui professionem talem aq; ac illi pratendimus, & propugnamus, in principiis nostris tergiversari, vel saltem remissiores quam illa postulant nos gerimus, dum promissue illos in gremium ecclesiae acceptamus, qui neq; professionem omnino unquam formaliter ediderunt, nisi per susceptores in Baptismo, aut ullâ probabili conjecturâ, tali qua requiritur professioni consentaneos vitâ & moribus se indicant. Quanto igitur causa nostra prejudicio, hic cum fratribus nostris in hanc arcam, veluti in propriam suam arcam, descendimus, facile apparet, ubi si victos vos esse non fateamur aut herbam demus, haud fortasse prudentia nostrae & fortioribus rationibus, sed omnia potius consuetudini, opinioni, & ut cum Poeta loquar, defendenti numero accepta referenda erunt.

Observandum est igitur, & equa animi lance nobis perpendendum, quod quocunq; Apostoli se contulerunt, Evangelium eos predicasse, & quosdam ibidem loci credidisse, sive sermonem eorum recepisse, in Actis legimus, & ita insistatis divinis se subiectasse (scilicet baptizabantur, in doctrinâ istâ, communicatione, panis fractione, & precibus perseverabant) & ex hac materiâ, sive ex ijs in unum catum hoc modo coeuntibus, conflata & constituta est ecclesia. Simon verò & ipse credidit, & Baptizatus perducebat apud Philippum. Unde pace fratrum meorum, hoc colligerem. Doctrina scilicet Evangelica exosculationem, in oppositione ad quascunq; alias religiones, & sui subjectionem institutis divinis (sive cultus, sive disciplina) in loco quo quis vivit usurpatis, ut medijs ad gratiam ævificam, si eâ adhuc se destitutum sentiat obtinendam, esse id (scilicet unicam ad hoc prærequisitam conditionem) quod membrum constituit, sive ad receptionem alicujus in ecclesiam sufficit. Qui institutus ex legis auditu in lege aquiescit extrinsecus. Judæus est, teste Apostolo. Ro. 2. Tu credis unum esse Deum, bene facis, dic & Jacobus de ijs qui titulo tenus etiam duntaxat Christiani erant. Quid nunc igitur, sive fides assensus, cum externo Dei cultu juncta, visibilem, sive Judæam, sive Christianum efficeret?

Vox

Verum est fateor quod scriptura dum loquitur de membris alicujus ecclesie in genere, prout liquet in Epistolis Pauli ad Corinthios (quos inter, nonnulli ad vitia proclives, turpem agebant vitam) cum fideles appellat, alijs etiam iustis omnibus insignit, & ea cumulare illis attribuit, qualia renatis tantum competunt: Nulla tamen inde emergit consequentia, hac necesse esse ab illorum professione se tales esse (quasi sui ipsorum praecoces fiant Christiani) eriri, sed hinc potius, ut ab hoc primum ostenso quod huius rei caput, commodius statui mihi videatur. Quid? quod nihil omnino sane impedit, quin Ecclesie Charitatis iudicium a parte potiori totum denaminans, professioni alicujus progrediatur, & dum quispiam medijs ad salutem ducentibus utatur, & in via ejus, pede quo cepit, pergit, meliora & majora de illo speret & cavat, quam de se ipsemet depradicare, vel potest, vel audeat.

Membrum visibile nihil aliud est secundum communem Theologorum conceptum (si recte calleas) quam pro Christiano, sive pro membro reputari, vel in foro aut estimatione humanum, membrum haberi; Et dum ipse formalis rei huiusce ratio, xvera in nostrâ estimatione humana, solummodo consistit, si illi qui congregationalium vestigia premunt, neminem pro membro habere velint, apud eos, nisi talem professionem qua salvifica gratia spiciem illis prabeatur, edat; Et nos aliquem pro Christiano aut membro reputare, qui symbolo Apostolica Doctrina suam dederit assensum, parati sumus, quid obstat, quia totum hoc negativum in Ecclesie potestate solum sit, statuere omnino de eo, prout maxime rationibus ejus conducit; ita ut privatus quisq, sive minister sive alius, ejusdem iudicio, potius quam cujusdam hominis de seipso testimonium perhibentis professione acquiesceret? Immo quum ab Ecclesia non assensus solum requiratur, sed etiam publica cultus divini frequentatio & disciplina ecclesiastica (quacumq, extat) submissio, quâ, si turpi vitâ offendiculum, aliqui, bonis praebeant, & indigios tali estimatione se ostendant, eijs ipsos ex statu illo, sive excommunicari, consensunt: Cui damno quoque fuerit, charitatem suam (qua omnia credit, omnia sperat) laxare quantum fieri potest? Et cui nocuimento promiscuè omnibus (nondum excommunicatis) libertatem & ius ad externis divini cultus institutis utendum concedere, prout media sunt, ad conditionem federis acquirendam, dum nos etiam non minus quam illi, ad federis beneficia & salutem obtinendam, conditionem ipsam (scilicet vera iustificantis fidei & respicientia) aq, requisitam & necessariam studiumus & inculcavimus.

Quod

Quod ad hoc professum videtur quod in confirmatione
in ecclesiam receptum est. Etiam si obstat ad sacramenta
accessum, adeo necessaria decantatur. (Sed ad invicem pendendum vir-
tatem animi cogitata enunciantur.) Hoc non habet esse verum,
eos qui a Johanne baptizati sunt, confessori fuisse peccata sua. Et
nichilum a Philippo baptizatum, filium suum, videlicet Christum esse
Dei filium, asseruisse, hoc est, fuisse asseruisse. Hoc historicum, &
professionem aliam ad hanc rem necessariam fore, ab alio ad incorpo-
rationem (ut ita loquar) etiam in ecclesiam, requisitam esse in Evan-
gelio non memini. Verum quidem est sub veteri testamento, cum
primum Israeli Deus legem tradidit, totum eorum curam legimus
a Jehova stipulatum esse sponsonem, fore sibi Deum, tunc ut am-
bulent in vijs ejus; verum sponsio hac & pro se & pro liberis
(Deut 19. 25.) sufficiebat, adeo ut nulla alia professio, ad inscrip-
tionem eorum in statum istius ecclesie inuncta legimus, in suis genera-
tionibus. Nihil moror bonos illorum reges & Prepositos, identi-
dem ad renovandum fidem, populum generaliter compulisse, cum per
idolatriam discederent a Deo suo, aut cum emergens aliqua occasio
hoc postulabat. Sed renovationem talem ad constituendam ecclesiam
membra, & ad sacramentorum suorum usum, nusquam requisitam
esse, loca Gal. 2. 15. Rom. 11. Ez. 16. 20. et similia ubi Israelitas,
Judæos, natu esse, & privilegia externa inde fluxisse, satis testantur.

Et hic quidem termini ipsi visibiles & invisibiles, ab homini-
bus excogitati, & Ecclesie applicati, praesertim primum istud ipsum
Apostoli (Ro. 2.) Judæum distinguens, in illum qui in propatulo,
& qui in occulto Judæus est, referant, non parum opinioni
huic meae fidem facere videntur. Quicquid in membro aliquo vi-
sum, certum & apparens, dici potest, nihil aliud est, quam quod
iste religionem Christianam, illius instituta publice observando istius-
usque disciplina se morigerum prestando, amplectitur; Et quod ad
gratiam ejus corde latentem attinet, ejusdem professio verbalis, cre-
dibilem illam quidem, sed visibilem nullo pacto proprie lo-
quendo reddere potest. Porro, sententiam hanc Parabola illa E-
vangelica de tritico & zizania dilucidat plurimum. Narravit
Parsifamilias servuli tritico immista esse zizania; Scimus, oculis
cernunt, pro certa habent, esse zizania. Quemlibet igitur homi-
num quotquot vivunt appello sciscitorum, qui potest quisquam vi-
sibile esse ecclesie membrum, idemque eodem tempore apparere zizania-
num? Et apparuerunt etiam zizania. Secundum communem
nosstrorum Theologorum de hac re predictum sensum hoc quidem
prosum

propterea vocatorum esse rationem. A professione scilicet verè renata gratia, in numerum regeneratorum (prout fert eorum sententia) unusquisque ascribendus est, hoc est pro regenerato existimandus sive censendus. Et existimatione aliorum regenerari, ac visibiliter renatum, sive membrum visibile esse, eodem recidit. Hoc verò in loco, homo qui xizanum dicitur, aperte se prodit esse xizanum, & proinde in aliorum existimatione nihil minus quam regenerati nomen sibi ascribit; Unde nihil dilucidius consequi potest, quam xizania visibilia membra non esse censenda, cuiusdam professionis ergò, a qua tristici nomen sortirentur, sed reverà quia in agro una cum tristicis nascuntur & coneroscunt, hoc est, quia divina instituta, procer scilicet publicas, conciones, sacramenta, una cum alijs religionem nostram amplexantibus, attendunt & exosculantur, immò etiam ut medijs a Deo illis ad salutem adipiscendam concessis, utuntur. Hoc equidem illud est quod de ipsis palam fit, et si aliter visibiliter, xizania, quam plurimis forsan Dei servis immorescunt.

Neg, silentio etiam pratercundi sunt termini isti salvatoris ipsius nostri, huc spectantes qui commodissime omnium nobis inseruiunt, cum distinctione illa vocatorum & electorum, idem hoc designat. Multi quidem sunt vocati pauci verò electi. Mat. 22. 14. Per vocatorum vocabulum illos denotat (ut ex textu patet) qui convivio interfuerunt (sive cum, sive absq, veste nuptiali) hos ab alijs discriminans qui extranei ab Apostolo vocantur 1 Cor. 5. 12. Eph. 2. 12. & ita a receptione Evangelij eos invitantis, & institutionis ejus sui ipsius deditione (quod forsan ista phrasis convivat fieri, sibi vult) neminquam verò ex professione gratia (sive nuptialis vestis) definiendi sunt.

Quid quaso fratres, num tota moles populi Israelitici quatenus populus Dei, circumcissus, & fadere inito factus peculiaris, in verè renatorum catalogum asciti fuerunt, vel ascitis reputabantur? Qui sit igitur ut clamites aliquando Propheta, Omnes esse in corde incircumcisos? Qui sit ut promissum illud, Ego circumcidam cor tuum, &c. cor feminis tui, ad Israelitas pertineret faderatos? Immo, qui sit ut novi federis ipsius palmaria quedam promissio sit, Leges meas cordi eorum inscribam, si nulli intra faderis terminos sint admittendi nisi tales, qui illam legem jam corde inscriptam habere censentur? Ecclesia igitur (prout mihi maximè videtur) assimilanda est Schola cuidam, in hoc a Deo instituta, ut introducerentur quamplurimi ibi convertendi, potius quam corporationi, sive sodalitati, eorum solum qui jam sunt conversi, aut revari. Et quod ad faderis attinet cui sese obligant

cum huic inhiarentur, quam commodè fieri posset, si quod ego sentio potissimum, expromere liceat, facile videamus. Videntur mihi quidem Theologi cum Dei federe (licet sine injuriâ aut opprobrio) hic agere, perinde ac Hanun cum Davidis servis qui præcidit vestes eorum per medium, dum dimidiatam ejus partem, promissoriam scilicet, unice nobis proponunt, & partem alteram, comminatoriam silentio obrunt altissimo; Quod si totum ejus quod nobis promulgatum est, utrisq; partibus, tam comminatione quam promissione comprehensum, rite perpendamus, quantum ad rem nostram momenti habeat, haud distu opus est. Eadem scriptura quæ nobis annuntiat, Qui credit salvabitur, annunciat etiam Qui non credit damnabitur; nisi respiscatis omnes peribitis. Et sicut quibusdam salus annuntiatur, ita & quibusdam judicium, ex Pauli Evangelio. Ro. 2. 16. Cum omnibus e lege recitatis maledictis, Deut. 27. dicendum erat Israelitis, Amen, Nonne illud animarum isdem fœderi astrictio fuit, ac cùm benedictiones morem gerentibus illis sunt promissæ? Deut. 19. 14. cum 19. Deut. 30. 19. &c. Et quanam alia in illa t̃ Amen repetitione excogitari potest fides, præter illam assensus? Sicut Adamus dum in statu integritatis, & propter illam, sub vita remansit, vel tum quoad maledictionem conditionalem, siue positis conditionibus denuntiata, Dei erat fœderatus, adeò ut pacti illius iniri hæc pars fuerit, ut si ex vetito fructu comederet illi moriendum sit: Ita homo in statu natura & peccati, & propter illud sub morte adhuc constitutus Dei fœderatus esse potest, quoad benedictionem conditione positâ promissam, quòd si credat & respiciat, salvus fiet. Atq; ut nulla alia præter fidem assensus, Adamo, quâ comminationi illi credidit, unde ad fructum vetitum devitandum cautus redderetur, & ad pactum illud (quoad comminationis partem) cum Deo feriendum; adesse, potuit: Ita fides assensus quâ Dei promissis credit homo, utpote verissimis, unde ad mediis omnibus quibus eorum compos evadat utendum incitatur, ad ineundum jam fœdus (quoad promissionis partem) etiam sufficit. Ad obedientiam pollicendum quid ni valeret fides solum historica, procerto se aliter damnatum fore homini suggerens, cum ad quod promissum est inviolatè præstandum, nihil valeat, nisi ipsa salvifica Dei gratia? Adeo ut aliud prorsus sit fœdus ferire, & longè aliud fœdus percussum servare. Pl. 78. 10. Federe illo se devinxit Adamus, quod maledictionem completebatur, priusquam illi, nulla se ex parte reddidit obnoxium.

Adolescentes recens in Academicorum numerum co-optati, ad iurandum quod vocant matriculationis adducuntur, se statuta Academia

Academia esse praestituros; Subit mihi memoria diti illorum dicentium, Sacramentum illud penale esse, adeo ut licet, in leges pecces, non tamen infirmulandus perjuris, si parvam a legibus intentatam exequaris. Tali sane aliquâ interpretatione (quantum ego ratione assequi possum) oportet nos publicam illam nostram coram Ecclesia sponfionem dignari, quâ nos huc adigimus ex pactione factâ, nempe conditiones latas praestituros esse, eodem animo scilicet, quo beneficiis inde manantibus nos fruituros esse speramus, nec inclementius nos tractari musitabimus, si debitum, promissis violatis, supplicium luamus. Eo res redit; Obligatio est quaedam, nomine pactionis, sub multa pactione, conditionata promissio; Unde quo modo, illis, qui conditionem adhuc nondum assecuti sunt, liceat tamen eidem se devincere, & irrogenus Dei federatus fieri, luculenter patet, & difficultas omnis expedita est. Quâ enim aliâ mente quaso, a Deo scilicet approbatâ, potuit universus populus Israel sanctissimâ respulatione illâ praestiteri, Omnia haec verba quae dixit Jehovah faciemus, cum plerique, eorum ob pervicacem animum in deserto ceciderunt? Quo etiam alio sensu populum istum, iusto federe, alloquitur Moses? Hodie vobis vitam & mortem proposui, benedictionem & maledictionem, quare vitam elige, ut vivas tu cum semine tuo. Inspice Lector ingeniose, Deut. 11. 26. 27. 28. 29. & ejusmodi quamplurima loca, & quantum haec nostrâ referunt, accuratè tecum perpende; & si unicuique hoc tandem subjungam, ne gravare, viz. impossibile quidem esse, ut quispiam credat Evangelio, vel vera solum essa illa quae nobis annunciat, quin comminationi Dei ad futuram iram devitandam (Mat. 3. 7.) astrictus teneatur, & etiam saltem ratione, a mundo prorsus infideli, & ab alienatis omnino a federe, & statu Israelis contra-distingatur.

Inficias ire non possumus, in formâ Baptismi ab ecclesiâ nostrâ institutâ ab antiquis patribus acceptâ & collectis illorum ex ethnicis, membris aditis, potius quam nostris natu membris (aut naturâ Christianis, Gal. 2. 15.) accommodatâ, professionem requiri ab omnibus baptizandis adeo intensam, ut nihil supra; Verum ut vix subit intellectum, quomodo talis professio, infantis nomine, fieri queat; ita si quibus Lyturgiam nostram recognoscendi demandata sit potestas, ausi sint vel pilum latum ab antiquâ consuetudine (quae aliquando vetustas erroris est) discedere, & in locum istorum verborum actualiter prolatorum, Credo, abrenuncio, alia substituere, memet obligo, polliceor, vel similia (secundum ipsissimum Catechismi verbum Triam meo nomine compromissor pollicitus est) interpretatione ad nor-

meum mei sensus falli, & quadam alia verba hic & illic occurrentia per-
mutare, quæ externa ecclesiæ privilegia tanquam ad vere sanctificatos
tantum pertinentia, nimis in arctum videntur compingere; huiusmodi
forſan conſilium plus conferret ad futuram eccleſiæ pacem adverſus
ſeperatiſtarum phalanges, ſtabiliendam, quam ſi recognoſcentis ſty-
lum, multi alij in ejuſdem Liturgiæ loci, etiam paterentur; id quod,
ad præſentes fratrum noſtrorum animos ſedandos; & res ipſa, æquitas
q̃, Chriſtiana, & religionis quidem communis ſalus, poſtulare quo-
dammodo videtur.

Nullus dubito quin ſi publicâ authoritate, mandetur populo profes-
ſio quidem adedò intenſa, quâ intenſior excogitari vix poſſis, ad mem-
brorum confederationem & uſum inſtitutorum divini cultus in paro-
chijs ſingulis inſtituta, ij præcipue qui moribus magis diſciendi, &
formâ tenus duntaxat Chriſtiani ſunt, ſine minimo conſcientia grava-
mine, palam profiteri, in proprio ſuo nomine, parati adſtarent, Since-
ram ego in Domino fiduciam conſtituo; verè penitentiam ago; Chri-
ſtum mihi in Regem & Prophetam aq̃, ac in ſacerdotem aſciſco; ſpi-
ritum pro ſanctificatore meo accipio, & ut brevi abſolvam, quicquid
vis amplius; nec hæc dicentes magis urgeret ſcrupulus, quàm illos qui
baptizando Infanti ſuſceptores adhibiti, illius nomine (quod plerum-
q̃, ipſi neſciunt) miniſtro roganti, Abrenuncias carnem, mundum, &
Diabolum? reſpondent, hæc omnia abrenuncio. Qualis quidem
profeſſio, cum nulli niſi verè renato homini competere poſſit, necesse est
ut gravis admodum & vix ſerenda impoſitio talis, quibusdam vide-
retur, ſi omnibus in Parochijs ſuis degentibus, huiusmodi interrogati-
ones propoſituri eſſent, quibus pro certo ſcirent, ſe nihil aliud, quàm ad
aperta mendacia in medium proferenda, viam illis fratros, & ſolen-
nem Religionis iſtum actum in inane formalitatis ludibrium verſuros
iri, ſe apprehenderent. Praterè ſi aliqui forſan e membrorum nume-
ro ob profeſſionis iſtius defectum, excludendi comperirentur, maxime
pij hi forent, quibus tenera eſſet conſcientia, & ſingularis cordis in-
tegritas, qui non auſi ſint tale aliquid de ſe profiteri, quod excuſſo pe-
nitus pectore, pro comperto ſatis habeant necne, animi penderent. Hæc
ſerò perpendenti, ne mirum ſit tibi candide Lector, ſi externi viſibi-
lis membri deſinitionem a religionis Chriſtiana ejus amplexu ſolo,
quem inſtituta divina publicè attendendo, quodammodo ut oculis cerna-
tur palam facit, quàm a regenerationis profeſſione, deſumere ma-
luero.

Conſtitendum mihi eſt rem meam, in hoc, agi maximam, propter
opinionem, & libros quos de cana Domini, ante hæc in lucem emiſi.
Eccleſia

*Ecclesia sine & Faderis externum statum suos Relationem, genera-
limus ad sacramenta admissiōi, e parte nostrā omnes (in quan-
tum scio) substituimus praeſidium & fundamentum ; Jam verò si
verbe dei, aut ratione aliqua indubitata firmatum sit, neminem eccle-
sia membrum, sine Dei faderatum, esse posse, nisi qui ab ecclesia tan-
quam vere veniat fide & respiciētiā (ob ejus talem professiōem)
jamiam praeſidit esse supponatur ; Licet mihi ingenio & libere ut
honestum & integrum plane decet virum, palam edisserere, necesse
esse nūcūq, nostrū, a sententiā istā perpulchrā licet, & pergruā
quā sacramenta ecclesia ex instituto dei, conversionis modis esse statui-
mus & propugnauimus, pedibus recedere ; Et in locum ejus, hoc tan-
tum, scilicet, media quidē conversionis esse, sed ex accidenti tantum,
non ex primā ordinantis dei, vel ipsius administrantis ecclesia, inten-
tione, substituere oportet ; quamvis naturā suā adeo apprime compa-
rata, sive apta nata sint ad consequendum talem effectum, immo &
secundum diuinum ipsius decretum de eventu, non raro etiam istum
consequantur.*

*Video quidē Ecclesiarum protestantium, & (quod pluris facimus)
nostrae etiam, vulcum in hac re (si ad Iakobi verba alludam) quod
Ecce non est erga nos, dum vere penitentes & fideles ad sacro sanctum
hoc Domini institutum adhortans, ceteros alios serio cauere sibi ju-
bendo, quodammodo absterere, & amandare prorsus videtur ; Ac
proinde cum jam nou tantus sit metus separationis, quā antea ita pri-
dē, Occasione hāc data qua forsā nunquam iterum occurret, Cer-
tiores omnes facio, librum quendam auctore Baxtero nostro oculatissimo,
De jure ad sacramenta, post mea hujus farina scripta omnia edūm,
tanta perspicacitatis & perspicuitatis quoad notitiōem, tanta plenitudinis
quoad argumentorum efficaciam, & concurrentium Theologorum
sententijs adeo suffultum, ut cū Generali quidem a parte ecclesia ad-
missiōi, (ut ut a parte recipientis strictus sit) non minus quam ego
possum, patrocinetur, dissimili licet, Professionis suā (quā omnino
insistis) ratione, cui tanquam communi ad sacramenta accessus fun-
damento iniicitur : Omnibus auctor sum, ut in maiorem hujus rei
controversa cautelam, & conscientia, & mea & sua ipsorum securita-
tem, istum reuoluant simul etiam cum ecclesia nostra Liturgia & tan-
quam fide digniorem, & tutiori fortasse, saltem prout huic quam
maxime confitenti (si rite quidem teneatur) de Trinā referunt,
pra meis qualibuscūq, scriptis omnibus, sibi habeant, & amplecten-
tur. Animam quidem libero meam ; Interim cogitationes hasce lar-
giores quasdam meas, quae contra communem opinionum aliorum tor-*

rentem promovere nihil forsā valebunt, mihi reservo; hoc unicum ta-
men in genere, Cordatorum & prudentiorum iudicio discutiendum,
humiliter propinens, Annon vulgò recepta Protestantium sententia
(quam Reverendus ille vir & sagaciter & fideliter nobis obtulit) tam
arctum visibilis ecclesie fundamentum iacitorium, quale est, nullum
nisi verò regenerate fidei professio, fenestram ad congregandas (sic
prius segregandas) ecclesias adeo latam aperuerit, ut nisi huic malo,
ejusmodi excogitato remedio sit occursum, major erit visibilis vulneris
hiatus, quam ut ulli alio adhibito medicamine valeat coalescere; Im-
mò ut si quis vel maximo percitus desiderio hoc satageret, jurandum
illi esset, in illo die dicendo, non essem obligaturus, Etiam domi-
meæ non est parvis neq; vestis, ut ruina ista sub manu mea sit.

Quantum ad alteram præsentis instituti partem attinet. Deplo-
randum sane est nobis adeo minutulas in Opinione differentias, tan-
tam inter Ecclesie ejusdem filios, ac Religionis ejusdem professores, ani-
marum facere disjunctionem, & affectus Christiani divorcium. Mi-
seret me nostra ecclesia, si honoris & dignitatis inter Ecclesiasticos
accumulatio, ut olim inter Abraham & Lothum fortunarum accretio,
fratres disjungeret; Profectus est Lot orientem versus, & sepa-
raverunt se alterum ab altero. Magnam quidem antiquitati vob-
nerationem deberi, in confesso est; Et qui in veterum scriptis vel ob-
iis versantur Episcopatum Apostolorum vestigia propemodum preu-
sare minime dubitant, veruntamen ut omnia non revoluta, & imma-
ta manentia, successu temporis situm contrahunt: Ita accidit Eccle-
sie, ut inter Episcopatum primitivum, & qui mundum jam invasis-
modernum, differentiam certe aliquantulam vel cæcus aspiciat. Quæ
differentia si ratione formalitatis cujusdam veluti in negotio electio-
nis (quæ qualis fuit primitiva, ex epistolis Cypriani apparet) so-
lummodo esset, non adeo magni momenti (licet observanda tamen)
res foret: Sed quum in precipuo ipsius regiminis Ecclesiastici fine,
qui sanctitatis scilicet publicæ & animarum salutis (non externæ
solum concordia) promotione consistit, sita est: & finis iste procul du-
bio sine Presbyterorum cooperatione & mutuo auxilio, tam in ducen-
do quam docendo gregem, adeo feliciter obtineri nequeat, res quidem
non parvi sed maximi ponderis hic agitur, qui sicco pede, immo siccis
oculis, haud sane prætereunda est. Quam bonum & amicum (si
verbis loquar Psalmistæ) videtur, si ad portandum onus grave plu-
res admoveantur humeri, & ad opus grande peragendum, plures ad-
hibeantur manus, & ita scilicet habitarent fratres etiam una. Si
Mosi consilium Jethronis adeo arripit (juxta Hieronimum) quan-
tum quæso Episcopo incumbit, ut Presbyteris aurem facilem præberet
vel

vel hoc potissimum nomine, quo seipsum ovare levaret; & de ratione dispensationis sua aliquid diminueret, in magnam futurum diem satagere. Equitas vestra innotescat omnibus hominibus, Dominus Prope est.

Non est quidem privati cuiusq; unionis publicae terminos eudare, quae unanimo consensu & mutua ope eorum qui ad opus istud designati sunt (vel fuerunt) transigenda est. Si nihil aliud nisi Declaratio Regia extaret, pacem quadantenus conciliandi via & methodus nobis praemonstraretur, modo illarum qui eam confecturi essent, voluntas ipsa non deficeret. Quantum ad meipsum attinet, libere ego & aperte protestor, Ecclesiae Anglicanae felicitatem in eo, prout mihi persuasum habeo, consistere, si Episcopi ad moderatiorem aliarum partium, de ijs, quae iusta sunt, sententiam utcumq; potius descendant, quam si amice in omnibus ad illarum mores & praescripta se componere manibus pedibusq; festinarent. Immo etiam ut plenius loquar, quamvis Toleratio magis sobrijs, pacem publicam excolentibus, & nulli incommodatibus, ad conscientiae suae fruiotionem concessa, res foret pijs & probis pergrata, quae maximas ex animo gratias Deo ijs eliceret; Tantillum tamen, quod Christiani, eadem lege & omine, inter Turcas, & inter Papicolas Protestantes frui possunt & fruuntur, beneficium homini acceptum referre, jejunum certe & sterile, benignitatis inops quidem, immo & vile pronuncio, praeter eo, quod nos expetivimus, & in nomine Domini adhuc postulamus, iustam nempe & equam inter utriusq; partis fratres, vel saltem Episcopum inter, & Praebitos eius juxta Ecclesiae Primitivae exemplar, ex compositione factam concordiam; quae sola omnibus ijs quae ad gloriam regni Christi in Anglia spectant, respondebit. O Hierosolymam; Hierosolymam, exclamatur Salvator optatus noster, & flevit super ea, dicens, si vel tu nosles hoc saltem tuo die quae ad pacem tuam pertinent, sed ea nunc occulta sunt oculis tuis.

Inter alia, in quibus vel minima concessio plurimum praestaret, intricata Ordinationis renovanda materia, quae revera in casu nostro, ad concordiam inveniendam primus gradus est, se nobis offert; quam si fratres mei omnino, in actu signato, illicitam esse existimarent, a patre suo, cedere, nullo pacto possent, ideoq; meum quaecumq; hoc de subiecto scriptum, Ecclesiae Dei hoc temporis puncto acceptum fore spero: Et si Ecclesiae nostrae Antistites in actu exercito, omni iusta & debita moderatione erga eos quorum voluntas prompta, ac conscientia hac in re tenerissima est, uti nolunt; praecipue cum animadvertant ad quam aquas concessiones Antagonistae mei redacti sunt, sive ultra offerunt.

offerunt, negotio huic ultimam manum imposuero, & tunc illo verbis
paucis immutatis, non sine indignatione, inuisa quidem at iusta offer-
bescenti tamen, missos facio. Equus te pretium est in manibus sa-
pientum ad possidendam pacem, at deest animus illis?

At ut vero res conferat, nos semper sub manu, oculis, & potestate Dei
gratiosissimi sumus, qui pacis Author est & conservator Concordia;
& in super sub Regis clementissimi imperio, qui propositiones ad pacem
& unionem inter suos subditos Christianos reducendam & conservan-
dam publice produxisse haud dedignatus est, quas & propterea ex ani-
mo suo profectas esse, Religio est, nobis existimare. Si, vero ille
postquam omnia expertus est, concordiam hanc, per mutuum scilicet
inter Presbyterum & Episcopum compositionem, tentatam, re infelici
dimittere cogatur; nequiquam spero hoc faciet, nisi in clementissimis
saltem illis verbis Achilchi ad Davidem. Ut vivit Jehova tu recta
es, & bonum videtur in oculis meis egredi te & ingredi te mecum
in castra, quia non deprehendi in te malum; ex quo die venisti ad me
in diem hunc, sed in oculis istorum satraparum bona adhuc non vi-
deris.

J. H.



A SECOND
DISCOURSE
UPON
Re-ordination.

HAving met with a certain Book of some worthy person, under the title of *Χρονοβία ἢ Πραξιολογία*, and an unknown name, with *Animadversions* on my Discourse about Re-ordination, I perceive the Lord is pleased to call me forth to a new endeavour upon this subject, for the sake of my Brethren, unto whom I am already engaged. It is a truth, this author hath from *Mirandula*, *Non est in potentia hominis facere aliquid apparere intellectu suo verum quando, or quia vult*, and when I find so sober and temperate a person, who is willing, and professing it his advantage, to be of the opinion he opposes, if he could, declaring to me that he is not satisfied with what I have written, I cannot but in ingenuity be ready to have the lesse thoughts my self of the same, and advise my Readers to be the more cautious in receiving it: Nevertheless, so long as I find a kind of requiting temper in my breast (to my cost) apt to entertain the hardest prejudice, my own heart, or others, or the tempter can suggest against my self in this thing, which is followed many times with dark and dread reflexions, and yet when I consult with my judgement alone, (which I ought) and

follow the little unclouded reason that I have at any time to use about it, it appears to me, that both what this author sayes may be fully answered, and what I have, is for the main not touched, or in the weight not impaired, I can but be sorry my ability hath been no more to serve those I have desired, and be content, such as I have, to lay out yet once more in their behalf, and my own; though I must needs say, with such a heave and weakned spirit in good earnest, that I have more need to crave their prayers unto God, and be supported my self, then to offer fresh support and further satisfaction to others. *He giveth power to the saint, and to them that have no might be increased strength.*

A hard task it is upon me, unto him I look up; and I cannot well tell from whence to derive my discourse, which is sure to meet with so much prejudicate interest, and opinion. It is Custom I know and the common apprehension that rules the many, and while their heads run shallow, it is not enough for a man to embark in a sound bottom, unlesse we have something of the tide also, and stream with us. I remember what a strange thing the *Antipodes* seem to *Laſtanti*us, as others of the Fathers; and to beleeve any habitable land beyond the Ocean, was to the antient *Clement* another world, *ἄλλοτερον κόσμον*. It is enough certainly to make truth it self seem a crime if it appears but singular, and if *Paul* himself, but offers to bring some new thing, they will determin it beforehand to be babbling; though it was the spread doctrine of the Christian Religion. And yet is not this all, but there are the several engagements of mens spirits, and concernments to bee met with also, wherein, one must look to run the fate of such who are engaged in arbitrations, who when they have most carefully discharged their trust, doe reap but ill will on both sides; and only have left them the testimony of their own conscience, that though both parties (that are extream) be displeased, yet both have cause to be content. *Hee persued, and passed safely, even by the way, that he had not gone, with his feet.*

There is a School adage well applied to the Intellect; *Latus existens prohibet alienum*; and I perceive indeed here that the common notion which lies uppermost, hath so filled the minds of most, that Orders makes us Ministers, (which should bee rightly understood) and that we are Ministers already, that they

they have no thoughts hardly left them free born for the discussion of this matter. It is besides the Original humour of man, to be apt to think of himself more high then he ought to think (as the Apostle speaks) and not soberly, according to the measure God hath dealt him; and hereupon is the Ordainer ready to believe that in Orders he confers no lesse then the holy Ghost it self, his grace or gifts, or the spiritual power at least of the Ministry, which all are indeed the prerogative (I take it) alone of Jesus Christ; and does argue, both the pride of some mens understandings that dare assume so much without Gods word, and the lownesse of others, to take it up upon trust; as if our Protestants all, as well as the Papists were of that opinion. A large presumption, that lying at the bottom of this dispute, does require some of our first and most serious thoughts about it, as introductory to our businesse. *I said, I will answer also my part, I also will shew my opinion.*

To fetch this matter from the beginning; Let us look unto the Priests under the Law, and observe what God almighty hath said in the first place. *Exod. 29. 9. The priests office shall be Aarons and his sonnes, for a perpetual statute.* I gather from hence, that the Right, power, dignity, office of Priesthood, did flow immediately upon the priests under the law from this statute, which is undoubtedly Gods will appointing of it. If the spiritual power or authority of the priest (as our Book of Orders calls us) came only by such a defegation, that conveighes the same through mans hands, then was the priests under the law no priests, or had no power, for they were not ordained priests, but born priests; and this right and power of priesthood was theirs, we see expressly, *by this statute for ever.* We read indeed of the priests sanctifying themselves often to some particular work, as to carry the Ark, to cleanse the Sanctuary, and the like, but we read not that they were to be consecrate to their office, as I yet finde. We read indeed that the high Priest as he succeeded, was to be consecrate, and annointed, and so Aarons garments were kept on purpose, but forasmuch as this dignity in self of the high priesthood, came also by birth, it is apparent, that their anhoiing and consecration did not give them their right and office, but only solemnize and confirm it; as princes who are so by birth cannot have the regal office conveighed, but declared and ratified by their inauguration. As for the

rest of the priests, we read of one consecration only by *Moses*, at once for all of them, *Lev. 8. Exod. 29.* And certainly we may conceive, if God did intend that the Ministerial power should be conveyed ordinarily through the hands of man any other-wise than as the signifiers of his will, then should not one consecration (it is like) have sufficed for all, but he would have commanded every one of them to be particularly consecrate, or set apart for the receiving that power by man in their generations. Besides when *Aarons* sonnes are consecrate at once by *Moses*, this is all you shall find in it. An Investiture by several ceremonies (you may see *Lev. 8.*) which all are manifestly (without the least word or form of conferring power) by the way onely of external solemnization; and an Attonement made by sacrifice for them, because else they might not approach the holy God in their sins; and therefore, is said, *This shalt thou do to ballow them to minister in their office, Exod. 29. 1.* It is not said, *This thou shalt do to give them their office.* Their office was conferred by Gods appointment, and the hallowing them is only to the work, that they might stand before the Lord to execute their service in the holy place.

And now let us come to look also under the Gospel; *All power* (sayes Christ) *is given me in heaven and earth, Go, preach, and baptize.* Here we see from whence the authority of the Ministry is derived, and that is from him only who is the Master of discipline, and fountain of power. And does he say this to his Apostles only? No; it followes, *And lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.* Again, when he ascended and gave gifts to men, as he gave some to be apostles, so he gave some to be pastors and teachers, *Eph. 4.* It is he then gives the office; putting us in the Ministry, as *Paul* speaks, *1 Tim. 1. 12.* In *Mat. 9. 38.* It is the father sends forth labourers into the harvest; and though those Elders (it is likely) as *Ephesus. (Acts 20.)* were ordained, yet as for their power, it is expresse the holy Ghost made them Overseers. We receive our commission and authority from them whose ambassadors we are, but we are not the ambassadors of men, but the Stewards of God, *1 Cor. 4. 1.* and ambassadors of Jesus Christ, *2 Cor. 5. 20.* Who then is that faithful Steward, whom his Lord shall make ruler of his household, *Luke 12. 42.* It is the will (I gather) and appointment of the Lord which gives the formal being of a ruler to this Steward, and as

for the servants they might indeed deliver him the keyes; and so be said if you will to make him steward (which is to be known also) by the way of investiture and external possession.

The London Divines, who are to be much regarded in such works of theirs, In *Jus. Div. Min. Evan* c. 11. after they have told us that the contrary is maintained by many Reverend Divines (which by the way, may dash some, who think this Opinion of mine to be singular) and are laying down arguments to prove that Orders do give the Ministerial Office (which arguments I shall answer in due place) they check themselves in their course, and tell us, they mean it only as to the essence of the outward call; and if that indeed be all, let us take their meaning thus, that it gives the Office *before men*, so that a man is (and is to be) taken for a Minister thereupon, which in the Court of the Church he was not before, and that does hit the truth (I think) and bottom of this matter. I do not doubt but we may say (as we do ordinarily) that Ordination makes us Ministers, nay that it makes us so, as we were not before; but then we must understand this aright; There is therefore this distinction (which is clear in its own light) to be received here, unless we will remain still in the dark; and that is this, The Ministerial power which a man hath, by virtue of that grand warrant, *Go and Teach all Nations*, must be considered as good, *In foro Dei*, or *In foro Ecclesie*. There are many worthy Persons who devoting themselves to this service, have preached a good space (as *Origen* of old) before they have taken orders, (when perhaps they have forborn the Sacraments) and we may not doubt but some of them have converted souls; Now where there is conversion, there is Faith, and where there is that preaching as begets Faith, the Preacher must be sent; which is expresse *Ro. 10. 15.* and consequently such a man then must have his Commission in the Court of God, when he hath none yet in the court of man, and is not a Minister yet indeed as to the Church, before Orders. Ordination then does make a man a Minister, as Baptism makes a Christian, when he hath saving grace before. The Orders of the Church does give the Ministry, as the absolution of the Church does forgive sinnes; that is, where a man hath true faith and repentance, and so is forgiven in heaven. It is the prerogative of God to forgive sinnes, and

yet doeth the Church forgive them in her court, that is, declares and pronounces to the penitent remission, as our Liturgy hath it. It is the prerogative royal of Jesus Christ to appoint his own officers in his Church, and yet does the Church make a man a Minister in her court, that is, declares, pronounces him to be such, approves and confirms his call from the Lord by this solemnity. There is no man taketh to himself this honour, but he that is called of God, Heb. 5. This calling then of God is that which gives the honour and office in his sight, and the call of man (whereof Orders is the consummation) does give it him before men, by solemnization. If it must be first given of God before a man may take it to himself, I gather *a fortiori*, it must be first given of God before another can apply it to him by the ceremonie thereof. And Abraham received circumcision, a signe of the righteousness of faith which he had while he was uncircumcised.

As for the outward call those Divines speak of, it must bee opposed to the inward; The inward call is this call of God as distinguished from mans. Herein I have conceived three things. 1. The Institution, which is Gods appointing such an office to bee, and that those who have such gifts shall bee such officers. 2. The Gift, which is Gods endowments of a person adapting him for this office, and that peculiarly above others; which I put in, because the abilities of a person are warily to bee considered, according to mens severall capacities, dispositions, condition, and those circumstances of providence, and otherwise, which render severall men of the same parts, serviceable to their generation, under severall employments. 3. Consent, which is the resigning a mans self hereunto, and does lye in those holy and sincere desires and ends, that the spirit of God alone can stirre up, and a man ought to have, that does devote his life to so sacred a function, to wit, that his great aim in the prevailing Interest of his heart be nothing else but the glory of his Redeemer and Salvation of mens souls. When God now hath given the second of these to wit the gift; the first alone does necessarily convey to him the Power, and makes the third his duty. Unto every one of us is given Grace according to the measure of the Gifts of Christ, Eph. 4. 7, By grace is meant there (I suppose) Authority or Office (as we shall see more somewhere) and then it followes, where there are Christs gifts this

Autho-

(7)

Authority to use them is given with them. So 1 Cor. 12. 7. *The Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withall.* The Gifts alone do infer a power to edifie the Church by them. Hence in that place before Eph. 4. if we compare vers. 8. with v. 11. while Christ is giving gifts in the one, he gives the office in the other; And the reason is good, because the power does flow upon the gifts, from the Institution. A power let me say again, but in *Gods sight*; for it is not for every man to pretend gifts and straight be a Minister, which I shal meet with well enough, if you will attend a little till its due place. When the Lord in the parable gave the man his talent, that alone impower'd him and oblig'd him to traffique with it. There was no need more in a Prophet then to be inspired with a Prophecy to be sent of the Lord. No more can there be likewise required in a Minister to give him his Office *before God*, then this call of God. And as for the farther *call of man*, which is yet required to a Minister *before men*, that was not to a prophet, when there are already the three things mentioned, what can there be more herein distinguished therefrom (besides the commending a man to Gods grace, or the invocation of his blessing upon him for his work, which is the most signal end of this Rite. *Act. 14*.) then I and our Protestant Divines do account of it. *viz.* Such a Person presents himself to the Ordainers, they examine him, and what is it they are to search and to find? why if they consider what it is, it is this, whether the man hath the gift, whereupon they may conclude that he is commissioned according to Christs Institution, and also hath sincere ends of being faithful in his place; if they find this, here is the *call of God*, and what is there remaining possible for them to do besides what is done, but to confirm it before men, that they may receive him? So that this Rite in its essence (to use those Divines word) is but the solemn Approbation, Declaration, or Confirmation of our call by God; and the immediate effect of it, is the value, repute, outward Authority, Account, or Esteem with men as Ministers of his, to all ends and purposes in the Church, and place where a man shall be so appointed. And this is that thing which orders does really and effectually give, which is not a matter neither of small moment, but of great consequence, even so much as the free passage of the Gospel comes to in the Church.

(6)

Church where we are ; which must therefore, and will keep up the head of Orders while the World lasts. Now Sirs ! The immediate effect of an action must be the end of the Agent, and forasmuch, as in this Change of times and Government which God hath brought upon us, this end and effect, doth fail us in our first Orders, we see how there arises upon a man even from Providence it self, without any other arguing, the necessity, the duty (supposing him at first, and still fit) and reason of his Re-ordination. And this I take it is the marrow of what I have in my first sheets, which is not yet so much as tasted or touched, by my Opposer, neither in his Book where he disputes upon this question, nor in his Appendix, which he hath against mee in the way of animadversion. I shall take both now into consideration, *I will speak, that I may be refreshed, I will open my lips and answer.*

SECTION II.

THere are two things in generall any one may see, upon which the streffe of what this Adversary hath, doth lye. The one is a supposition, which hath prepossessed the thoughts of most concerning the nature or end of Ordination; The other is the *form* the Bishop uses, supposed agreeable hereunto, and inconsistent to our case. To begin with the first, which hath cost me some words already, and requires many more. Ordination (let us know) may be taken more *comprehensively*, as it comprizes election foregoing, so it is *Acts* 14. 23. & *Tir.* 1. 5, where those two words in the Greek text, I count equivalent, and well rendred in the old translation, *When they had ordained them Elders by election* : Or else it is taken *strictly* and properly for the Rite it self distinguishd from Election. So is it, *Acts* 6. 6. *Acts* 13. 3, *1 Tim.* 4. 14. *2 Tim.* 1. 6. which places I think are all we have expresse upon this matter. In the last sense, it concerns my discourse, and it is the solemn invocation of Gods grace or blessing upon a person in the work of the Ministry by the way of Approbation, Declaration or Confirmation, of our Vocation ; as I have been discoursing before, and in my first papers.

papers. I know it stands the Church of Rome upon, to speak higher then thus. *Ordo est sacrum quoddam quo spiritualis potestas traditur ordinato & officium*, sayes the Master of their Schools, *Lib. 4. Dist. 24.* and 'tis no wonder if his Scholars that follow, turn this into *Sacramentum quo character indelebili in anima imprimitur*: I see also some of the eminent Sons of our own Church, for her forme sake, derived from thence, cannot leave the like conceptions. But I suppose if our forreign Protestant Divines be generally lookt over, we shall find that definition, *Ordo est vocationis confirmatio*, most current; which Dr. Baldwin hath taken up as common with them, in his Cases: When Calvin, and our Divines that follow him, speak of the Sacraments as Symbolls of grace, they understand it not as signs conferring grace, but as signs of grace conferred, *Rom. 4. 11.* and define them *the confirmations of our grace*. Now what they take from the Sacraments, they are not like to give to Orders. *Ordo* (sayes Bullinger in his Decads) *est Symbolum delegati muneris*: The Symboll of Gods grace, sayes Calvin in his Comments and Institutes. There must be this grace or gift then, this *munus delegatum*, (to wit a *deo*) before, or the Rite cannot (according to their Doctrine) be the Symboll of it; and this is so, for a man is tryed, and the Ministerial grace found in him, and then does the Church use this Rite as a sign, token, symboll, by way of testimony, or ratification of it. *Vocatio debet habere publicum ecclesie testimonium, & ritus ordinationis nihil aliud est quam talis publica restructio*, sayes Obemnitius. *De Eccles. Electioni saepe addi solet publica quadam per preces & manuum impositionem inauguratio, & velut in ipsum muneris administrationem missio, quae confirmatio dici solet.* Arminius *Disp. priv. thes. 59.* *Ordinandi potestas seu in ministerio confirmandi* The Leyden Divines. *Præsentatio & confirmatio.* Musculus. *Ministorum approbatio.* Erasmus Sacerius. *Consecratio & in muneris possessionem immissio.* Wendiline. *Personæ examinate ad functionem obbundam introductio & confirmatio* Polanus (*Syntag. l. 7. c. 10.*) Wollebius.

There is one proof which I will note, instead of many; It is known that the common thoughts of the learned, whether ancient or modern upon *Acts 13.* are that Paul and Barnabas were there ordained to their apostleship: so Chrysostom, so Dr. Hammond on the place. Now Pauls apostleship was certainly given him immediately by Christ, Ordination then (if this be ordination

according to the full stream) is not, must not, cannot be this Collation of the power it self, but this testification before the Church, whereof we are speaking, or a confirmation. *Melius est* (sayes that learned Professor of Wittenberg at first mentioned) *vocare ordinationem solennem ritum quo testificatur de legitima vocatione donisque necessariis.* In the Harmony of Confessions, It is taught that such be chosen who have gifts, and are of a blameless life &c. above all that they be proved whether they be such, and so afterwards prayers and sayings being made, they may be confirmed or approved of the Elders by the laying on of bands. The Bohemian Confession. So the Helvetian yet more full, but I shall have occasion to cite that more to my need somewhere hereafter, *Manus impositiones verba sunt mystica quibus confirmatur ad opus Electus*, sayes St. Ambrose upon 1 Tim. 4. and thus is it called *Oratio & benedictio* among the antients. If I were near some good Library I might perhaps turn over a score of Common places and Compendis of Protestant Divinity to prove this further; but I doe see half a dozen more before my eyes, and brought to my hands without labour; *Hunnus, Amesius, Crocius, Junius, Tarnovius, Voetius*, Lutherans and Calvinists, who express Ordination accordingly, *Declaratio solennis, Constitutionis testificatio, missio solennis in possessionem, manifestatio, promulgatio coram Ecclesia*, as Dr. Seaman hath them in his book of Ordination, and tells us They are to be understood of the rite of Ordination, to wit, as I intend it, distinguished from election, and in that sense may be admitted, and so is it rightly compared (he acknowledges) by our Protestants to Coronation, p. 16. Now then, as there may be reason of State sometimes for a double inauguration of the Magistrate; So may there be (if I may so speak) reason of Church, for re-ordination of the Ministers; and so long as both agree in their nature, the one may be (I suppose) a good argument for the other. There is a learned but too vehement adversary I see upon this subject, that does mention *Olivers* double investiture, before a Lord Mayor, and before a Parliament, as Protector; but he might have made mention of other examples, that would have relished better. Our *English* of old did feel of what advantage it was against them to the affairs of France, that *Charles* the 7th was crowned more then once. Yet will not I rest here; for we have sacred instances in Scripture even of the most famous of all the Kings of the Jewes, who were anointed from

from the Lord by the hand of Prophets and Priests, and yet inaugurated again after before the face of all *Israel*. And if what the forequoted judicious Doctor intimates to us (pag. 15.) be good, that anointing to Kings amongst the Jewes was in *some sense essential to their calling*, this one comparison alone, I judge, must needs strike a great stroke to the determining this matter.

It is true that the *Papists* and Schoolmen and some Antients, who make Orders to be a Sacrament, and a means of conferring the Holy Ghost, may look on it, as injurious to the Rite it self (as doth appear by a sentence of *Austin* and *Cyprian* this Author quotes) to repeat the same ; but our Protestants, and especially the more learned *Rabbies* of them (who tell us that this imposition of Hands was doubtlesse taken up from the custome of the Jewes (some add in their Synagogues) in ordaining their Elders, and not from the sacred mouth and command of Christ as Baptisme was) are not and need not be so strait laced in this matter. It is true also, that some of our own grave Divines are willing to put as high an honour as they can on this Ordinance ; Mr. *Hooker* who strives to do so, *Ec. Pol.* p. 410, 411, 412, 413. hath these words. *What Angel in Heaven could have said to man as our Lord did to Peter, Feed my sheep, Preach, Baptize, Do this, whosoever sins you retain are retained ? O wretched blindnesse if we admire not so great power ; more, if we consider it aright, and notwithstanding imagine any but God can bestow it !* The learned *Grotius De Imp. Sum. Pot. circa sac. c. 10.* will have these two things accurately distinguished, *Ipsa facultas, or jus, predicandi, Sacramenta et claves administrandi, and applicatio hujus facultatis ad certam personam* ; the one he attributes wholly to Christ, the other onely he allowes to Ordination: The eminent *Voetius De desp. caus. Pap. lib. 2. sect. 2. c. 20.* is proving that *solemnizatio, seu consecratio, seu ordinatio, seu investitura* (*ἐκθεσις* vocant patres græci) *illa externa quam nos confirmationem dicimus, does not tribuere ministerium, or is not ejus fundamentum.* I note the words in the expression, as well as the position of greater concernment to us. Honest Mr. *Perkins* upon *Gal. 1. 1.* does speak here as truly, fully, and well methinks to my mind as any mortall man can. I gather from hence (saies he) that the right to call belongs to God ; the Father thrusts forth Labourers into his Vineyard ; the Son gives

gives Pastors and Teachers ; the Holy Ghost makes Overseers : It may be objected that the Church hath Authority to call and ordain Ministers. I answer, that the Churches Authority is no more but a Ministry or service, whereby it doth testify, declare, and approve whom God hath called. Whose doctrine that is, that Orders do Imprint a Character those that read the Council of Trent may know ; That some of the eminent Papists do understand by this indelible Character, nothing but *spiritualis potestas*, those that read Bellarmine and Lombards definition before, may know ; unto what parties then consequently these two opinions, on one side, that Ordination does give the Spiritual power, and on the other, that it is the Confirmation of our Call, do appertain, may be known without a Monitor also. There is five Disputations about Church Government of Mr. Baxter, the second whereof, as soon as the Book came to my hand, did put me methinks out of countenance, to see when I had been beating long about something, with what fullness and perspicuity he hath gone before me. Let me set down a few passages. The Ordainers (p. 146.) do not give the power, as from themselves to others, nor doth it passe through their hands. It is the standing act of Christ in his Law that giveth the power immediately. The ordinary judgement I think of Divines is, that the Ministerial Authority is from Christ, but mediately, But this acute and known Divine sayes immediately : He explains it p. 147. As in the making of Bayliffs for our Corporations, either the people, or the Burgesses have the power of choosing, and the Steward or Recorder of swearing him, and performing the Ceremonies ; and yet none of these conferre the power, which he receives from the Prince alone, by the Charter of the Cities or Towns, as his Instrument. So is it in the Ordaining of Ministers : The People may choose, and the Pastors may invest, but it is God only by the Gospel Charter that conferrs the power from himself. You will say, though we have a Charter, a man is not a Magistrate till chosen, nor compleated till sworn, therefore it is mediately. I answer, true, it is mediately, or through the means of the people and Steward doing that which is their part, which is only designing the person, but not mediately through them as deriving the power, (which they have not themselves) that is, if you will, it is through them, putting the condition according to the Charter, for the Charter requires this, that a man be chosen, and sworn,

but

but the condition being put, the power flowes immediately from the charter it self: Why so here; *The power is immediately* (sayes he, p. 234.) *from Christ, and men do but open the door, or determine of the person that shall from Christ receive the power, and then put him solemnly into possession.*

This is what is clear and well, but there is a little more needfull to make it full. Although in this businesse of the Magistrate which is Civil, where the authority is of man, and the officers, officers of men, it is enough to look no further then men, and an outward court onely; yet in the businesse of the Ministry, where the authority is spiritual, and the officers appointed, the officers immediately of Jesus Christ and not of man, we are to look further unto God and his inward court also, and account that a man hath, and must have, his authority first in his sight, before he hath it in mans, and consequently what is done in mans court is by the way of Ministry signifying his will, for the declaration or confirmation thereof *with us*; to wit, The right, faculty, authority, or commission which a man hath *coram Deo* and the court of his own conscience, as being truly called of God, is allowed or approved by this publick testimony of the Church, so that he is received, reckoned, or numbred (as it is said of *Matthias*) amongst the Ministers of Christ, which is the very direct and proper effect of this external act of investiture and solemnization.

I will take an eminent passage from Mr. Hooker, who must be forced to understand here with us. *The cause why we breath not as Christ did on them unto whom he imparted power, is for that neither spirit nor spiritual authority may be thought to proceed from us, which are but delegates or assigns to give men possession of his graces,* Eccl. Pol. p. 431. And here then, I shall humbly call in my Episcopal fathers and brethren, who have been apt to wonder at me in my first sheets, that I should hold that Orders does not give the Ministerial power, when they may rather wonder at themselves that they should think it, whereas such a person as this, who was as like as any (by the rest of his discourse) to maintain it if he durst does disclaim it, as the doctrine of the Papists, by their practise (who do breath on the person whom they ordain, as Christ did) and not as the belief of our Church. And as for the delegation and assignment he speaks of, his meaning is express enough, to be no other then as when a Lord does give

or grant an estate to a person, he sends his servant to use those Ceremonies, which are to signifie that grant of his, by way of delivery, upon which he is received as the owner and possessor thereof. I will expresse it fully for him with a concluding passage from the aforesaid bright author. *Ordination is one means conjunct with others for designation of right qualified persons described in the Law of Christ for the reception and exercise of the Ministerial office, and the ends of it (besides taking care the office fail not) are, To judge in all ordinary cases of the fitness of persons ; and, To solemnize their admittance, by such an investiture, as when possession of a house, is given by a ministerial delivery of a key, or of land by a turf ; or as a souldier is listed, a King crowned, Marriage solemnized after consent and title, in order to a more solemn obligation and plenary possession. Such is Ordination. Mr. Baxter p. 149. When the King sends over a Lord Lieutenant into Ireland, he hath a power by vertue of that high dignity, of making a Knight; now while he uses the Ceremonies of dubbing, he uses them not as the signification of his Princes will, but of his own; He acts not here as an *Assigne*, but does it as an act of his own grace. We are not to conceive that God hath given such a power to the dignity of a bishop, that he may so make Ministers; No, no, their authority (as the solid and learned Mr. Perkins before) is but a Ministry, wherein therefore, they must act from God onely as the approvers, signifiers, or publishers, of his will, (and all those ceremonies they use, are the same external signification thereof) that such a one upon their examination is constituted by him according to his word and Charter, to be one of his Ministers, and that the Church is to receive him accordingly. Now then there must be this *will* first, before the signification of it, and the *will* creates the power immediately. The giving the power is one thing, with Mr. Hooker, most right, and the external investiture or delivery is another. But you will say, When an Estate or office is given by a person, and the delivery made also, how can this be done againe ? I answer, the office cannot be again given, but the signification that it is given, may be again. The Lords will is one, and the same, but the signification of it by outward ceremonies, may be various or multiplied. The ceremonies of the same consecration Lev. 8. 33. are repeated seven dayes together. Besides there is a difference in the point of *Delivery*. There is a delivery of possession*

session in the thing it self; As if I give one a book, and deliver it, and there is a delivery by a ceremony only, as the token of that possession: Here now there may arise controversie, whether such a delivery were legal and sufficient, or the like; and what course then can be best taken to put all out of doubt, but to have a new delivery which will be without exception. The case is so with us just; There is question whether Presbyters be Ordainers, and it may be question'd haply more to others purpose, whether in their Orders there was not a defect of some words of formall delivery, as *Take thou authority*; and if a quiet man then shall take the way to make all sure, there is no need that he should understand by those words of the Bishop, (and the imposition of his hands) that he does give him the power and office of a Minister, which he hath already, but rather that this is not given at all by mortal men, but only is indeed a second time *declared* or signified before the face of the church as given of God, by these external rites of investiture, delivery, or possession. I am sorry to see what a thin vail of words only can cloud mans understanding. If I should say that Orders, is the solemn-delivery of the Ministerial authority to a person by the Bishop as a delegate of Jesus Christ, it may be it would be received, and yet when I say it is the confirmation of Christs call, it is all one, but understood with more safety; which if it shall appear once in its light to my orthodox Adversary, I shall not need to say any thing else in comparison, to his satisfaction. The whole force of his arguing against me in this thing, hee knowes full well, does lye in this supposal, that Ordination does give the ministerial power and office, and is to be taken only, to that end; Now if the ground does fall from under him here, there is nothing left him hardly to stand upon, in the controversie.

Before I passe, let me here humbly lay down a caution: I would not have any offer to think that I and the forementioned author do go about to make light of Orders, as if when a man hath parts, he may streight goe and be a Preacher of his own head. There are none, I know, that hold Qualification a call, *coram ecclesia*; I am not a man of that complexion; I am so much for a solemn allowance of the Church, that I contend it should be twice done, rather then not bee done to purpose; God is a God of Order, and hath provided

vided against confusion and intrusion into his Church. I am ready then with that eminent person, to account, not only that it is a great sin to neglect Ordination, where it may be had, and that the Church is to disown such, and that it is required by Christ, and so necessary, *necessitate præcepti & medii too ad ordinem, & bene esse*: but I am willing to go so far, that he requires it in his Charter to every Church which is constituted, as a part of the condition, which untill it be put, the Authority *coram hominibus* is suspended. And yet so long as being put, it operates only to the power as a condition, doing but its own part; this hinders not but the same may be put, and put again, so long as it is not *omni modo*, to the same effect; and the nature thereof, or part it does, will bear it. What is that you will say? and in what regard possible can the effect be any other, and not altogether the same? An Answer to these two Questions will unloose the knot here of Re-ordination.

For the former: There are three things goes to a Minister.

1. *The testimony of their Conscience, of their sincere desire, not of lucre or honour, but to edifie the Church.* 2. *A faculty to do that to which they have a desire and will.* 3. *The Ordination of the Church, which approves and gives testimony of their will and ability.* So Mr. Perkins, in whose judgement methinks I rejoyce, to see how fully he agrees with me in his Notion of Orders, which yet I must confesse I took not from him, or any other Book, but from its own light in my first thets. Now whether this testification or approbation of the Church is such a thing, or no, I leave to this fair Adversary himself to judge; and I hope he will see, as those abilities, and desires, the chief part of the condition, Christs Charter requires, may and are to be renewed still, or encreased, so may the approbation of the same (*ad bene esse*) be renewed also, and our Ministry be the better, not as all the worse for it.

For the latter: When I allow thus much to Orders to be a condition, that is *causa sine qua non*, of our Office-power, I understand it (you must note it well) to be so truly, and only *in the Court of the Church*. A condition is such a thing you may say, as cannot be repeated, for as being put, the effect follows, and when the effect is obtained, the thing can have no longer the nature of a condition. I answer then, The Court of the Church, wherein alone I assure that Orders is this condition, is varied and

and doubled, and hence it is, that the condition it self also is doubled, and the effect flowing from the same varied likewise. While the court of the Church was Presbyterian, any Orders if Scriptural onely, was the condition; but now it is Episcopal, no Orders but Canonical also is the condition. In both courts then, or either of them, unlesse a person be ordained he is no Minister, and so the condition requisite to our authority *coram Ecclesia*, is the same in both, to wit Orders; but as these Orders which are the condition are diversified, and Episcopal Ordination distinguished from Presbyterian, so the condition, I hope, is not the same: In like manner the effect which flowes from the condition being put, in either or both these courts, is this *Church*-authority (as I speak) or the receiving us as Ministers in the court of the Church, and so is the same, but as these courts wherein we are so received (and are the *termini relationis*) are varied and not the same, in that regard the effect also must be diversified or multiplyed, and so not the same, though the same; which ends the difficulty.

Having laid this caution, there followes an Objection, which as to the main, hath sometimes been a stop upon my mind. I doe conceive that the Ordainers do act from God to the people, and the approving or declaring a mans Ministry more then once, drawes happily the ampler reception, and no absurdity in it: but I may be mistaken perhaps, and the Ordainers act from the Church or people to God, in presenting him a servant from amongst them to his house; Even as when the Levites were separate to God, Num. 8. it is said, *Aaron shall offer them before the Lord for an offering of the children of Israel*, v. 11. And hence are the children of Israel themselves to lay their hands upon them, v. 10. whereby there might be signified happily their parting with their right in them, which to do again were a kind of owning their right still, and look like sacraledge in it. But this conceit I guesse is some of that close superstition which is still apt to exercise my thoughts in this matter. It is manifest, that when God saved the first-born of the Israelites in Egypt, he challenged them to himself; the first-born of the cattel were to be offer'd in sacrifice to him, and for the first-born of their Sons he accepts the Levites; and hence it is they were the *offering of the people*, and that they laid their hands on them in offering them, because (I say) it was in lieu of their first-born,

D

which

which is all plain in the Text: *vers. 16, 17, 18.* Now as for us under the Gospel, when Jesus Christ the only true first-born is offered, there is no such propriety and discrimination, and consequently no offering of the Ministry in lieu thereof. Besides, though the Levites, whose office was but a service only, (to help Aaron and his Sons, *vers. 19.*) were an offering of the Children of Israel, the Priests, which was not a bare Service, but a Dignity, were no offering of the people, but taken by God into that honour and office of himself. The Subjects of a Prince may present him with slaves to do his work, but they present him not with Embassadors; (as we are) to be entrusted with the affairs of his Kingdom. It may be yet said, it is true, he that hath this honour, must have Gods calling, and consequently the Ordainers act from God in ordaining him; but there may be a middle way, to wit, that they act not from God to the Church or people, nor from the Church to God, but from God to God, and so their whole act be terminated in the sanctifying or separating a person to him, without reference at all otherwise, to the Church or people. As for this, though the thing be conspicuous in its own nature and solemnity, let us suppose (untill it appears farther) it were so, and then must we take into consideration what this separating or sanctifying a man unto God is. Under the Law it is plain there were sacrifices appointed, and by these the Priests and Levites were cleansed that they might draw nigh to God; Under the Gospel there is no Sacrifice, but only there are Prayers, and consequently the commending a man to the grace of God for his work by Prayer, is all that sanctification there can be in this matter; and as for the imposition of Hands it self, it is nothing but the expresse designation of the person upon whose head we crave the discession of his blessing. To which purpose Calvin in his institutions tell us, that this rite was taken from Jacobs blessing his Grand-children, which was by Prayer, *Gen. 48. 15, 16.* And Grotius is quoted by Mr. Stillingsfleet, speaking about the Jews ordaining their Elders, *Epi. ad Gal. Tunc orabant in sic Dei efficacia esset super illum, sicut manus efficacia Symbolum ei imponebatur.* By this *Dei efficacia* we must not understand the authority or power of the Ministry, as if in our taking Orders we did pray to God to give us that, as my Antagonist thinks strangely often, for Grotius himself, in his Book *de Imp.* before quoted,

quoted, accurately tells us; that comes not by Orders. *Christus procul dubio, in est a quo ipse illud predicandi, sacramenta exhibendi & clavibus utendi, oritur & vim suam accipit*: but we must understand thereby, the solemn invocation of the divine presence and assistance to be upon or with the person upon whom the hands are laid, (to use the words of that Learned Author) which may be repeated I hope, if need be; without question. To proceed here while we are upon it.

In a form of Church policy presented in a Convention at Edembourg, anno 1560. I read in Spenswood, p. 196. Other ceremonies then the publick approbation of the people, and the declaration of the chief Ministers, that the person there presented is appointed to serve that Church, we cannot approve, for albeit the Apostles used imposition of hands; yet seeing the miracle ceased, the using the ceremony we judge not to be necessary. In another, anno 1578. presented to the Parliament. Ordination is the separation and sanctifying of the person appointed by God and the Church, after he is well tried, and found qualified. The ceremonies are Fasting, Prayer, and Imposition of hands of the Eldership, p. 292. This notion of Ordination is that I suppose is like to passe with the Presbyterian, and perhaps one may think though a double approbation or declaration draws in it no absurdity, yet a Consecration of a thing or person to the Lord more then once, may seem hainous. Let us know therefore, that there is really no more in the thing under this conception, then under the other. This Learned man my Adversary himself, does well quote *Mason* and another, who holding with him, that the Office of a Bishop and Presbyter is the same, differing only *gradu*, not *ordine*; answer their new investiture with this, that our Church calls it not an Ordering, but Consecration, so that a double Consecration in the same Office, is not to be accounted belike any matter, they themselves being judges. The Temple under the Law we find new consecrated by *Hezekiah*: The Priests at the same time do new consecrate themselves, 2 *Chron.* 29. 30. 34. In the Gospel too we read again of *Festum Enceniorum*, Jo. 10. 22. But there is one instance alone does satisfie me in this thing beyond exception, and that is of *Solomon*, whom we read not only to be anointed, which is consecrated, but it is said expressly, to the Lord (that makes it sacred) a second time. If there was any native evil or absurdity in the thing it self, to

have a double consecration or investiture unto the same Office or work, how comes this to passe, that holy *David*, and his most wise Son, with the Fathers and Elders of all *Israel*, should make no scruple at all at it? There is this one Text much wanting therefore in my former sheets, which I now offer further to my case, 1 *Chron.* 29. 22. where I note three things. 1. That Ordination makes a man a Minister, (I count) as they are said in the words to make *Solomon King*. We none deny but Orders make a Minister, only let it be understood from hence, *Perfective*, Complementally, by way of Declaration, or Solemnization. 2. That a double investiture or consecration to the same Office, is expressly exemplified in Scripture (for which I quote this place) and why it should be more to be Re-ordained, then Re-annointed, no Protestant I believe can tell. So that where I have compared *Ordaining* in my Book still to a double Marrying, I wish I had rather put in *Annointing*, to make the simile the more sure. 3. That it is probable what Mr. *Rosse* (Pars. p. 8.) tells us, that this *Zadock* was High-priest at the end of *Sauls* reign, but *David* favouring *Abiathar*, preferred him, and retained them both, and consequently that he was annointed the second time Priest, as *Solomon* the second time King. So I close my first generall. And they made *Solomon King* the second time, and annointed him to the Lord to be chief Governour, and *Zadock* to be Priest.

SECTION III.

For the second generall: The Form which the Bishop uses, I will confesse it freely, to be so compiled to the ordinary conception of Orders, as is most proper for such as are made *ex non Ministris Ministris*, (as he speaks) yet let not my tender Brethren be troubled at this, seeing that hinders not but it may serve too, for those that are only declared to be *Ministri*, and confirmed, or regularly, legally, canonically made what they were truly in the sight of God before; It is the offence of mens minds makes this so grievous. There is no Ordination indeed is any more then a Declaration and Allowance before the Church

Church of a mans call from God, and let a man read the Form quite over, one may rather wonder at it, as a happiness there is no more incongruity to our case, then complain there is so much, as if it were compiled with some tender regard hereto, that if any were ordained before (as beyond Sea) otherwise, they might not scruple for all that (if they thought good) to submit to it. The words *Ordered*, and *Admitted*, is the worst this sober man himself can pick out, which when I see in the Instruments of our Orders, as it were purposely interpreted for us, *secundum ritum Ecclesie Anglicanae admissum & Legitimum & Canonice ordinavimus*, I cannot but conclude what I have said, and say that it is well this form indeed is no worse, (I mean more improper) seeing as yet we have no other. And if there shall come any future change hereto, I must forenote that that can neither be objected or pleaded as to me in the matter.

In this whole Forme there are these things. The Exhortations, and Prayers; The Ceremonies; The Deaconship; The Questions and Responses between Bishop and Minister; and after all (though that be beyond my Question) the Instrument of our Orders.

For the first: There are severall persons to be Ordained together, it may be twenty or thirty, (there was thereabouts Ordained with me) The Exhortations now and Prayers are delivered at once indefinitely; and that alone I hope does take away all scruple quite in this whole matter; for the case is the same as in our Sermons and Prayers in the Congregation, which will not I suppose be refused, because some one or other expression therein, is not apt and adzquate to the case of every individuall person. Neverthelesse upon a view of the whole I find not one petition or direction that may not be used in our case, let it have its grains of allowance and fair interpretation; and as for what this Author suggests as if we prayed to be made Ministers, or to receive the Ministerial power (which we have and are already) he may as well say, we are exhorted to be made so, and receive the same, equally with as much sense and truth in it. No there are prayers for Gods gifts and grace and assistance of his spirit to our Ministry, which I hope might be put up for the Ordainers themselves; and we are exhorted to our duty accordingly, but the Bishop prays not, that by his act the power may

may be given, which he holds no doubt to flow indispensibly thereupon; not through his prayer (which is for things contingens) but Christs institution. *Effectus ordinationis proprius est collatio potestatis, ad illum per se dirigitur, eundemq; (say such) perpetuo et infallibiliter consequitur.*

For the second the Ceremonies, such as the delivery of the Bible and the like I know no exception by any: onely if the meer repetition of imposition of hands be impleaded, then bath my kind Adversary to answer for the same as well as I, who is so farre from disallowing a second laying on of hands that he may be Godsfather to it himself, while in that distinction of *Χρησμός ordinativus et optativus* (from Mr. Vines) he hath christened the thing with the right names: and if he can come off from *Austin*, (as he quotes him) and other antients for this, who look on this *Χρησμός* it self to be sacramental, and so not to be iterated, I hope I shall not be concluded *ab auctoritate humana* neither in the same matter.

For the Deaconship, I have I think spoke enough in my first sheet, p. 92, 93. This haply is a thing, may be got to be waved by the Bishop, if it be desired, for which I have quoted *Aquinas*; If not, is as but used we know as formality, to any by himself, who are ordained Priest and Deacon at the same time; and though a mans spirit may be apt to rise at such a kind of favour, that we, who are Presbyters before, should be now promoted to the Order of a Deacon (*ad ordinem Diaconatus promovimus*) yet seeing it is but the Canonical stamp upon our Ministry (and that onely) we come for, which belike is to bee made at the leaning the hand twice upon it, so that we must be the half first, before the whole, and he that wills the end, wills the means; let us but get our hearts sincere in the thing, that we do this for the Gospel, sake, and I am perswaded seriously (as of some other like things) it may be received of the pious and the wise, with a smile, perhaps on the face, rather then with a wrinkle on the conscience. It is delivered by the antients, and received by the learned, that those Deacons we read of in the Acts were chose (at least some of them) out of the 70. Christ sent forth to preach, which may therefore be some good allay to a mans spirit in this awkward submission. This Gentleman indeed hath an expression (p. 67.) very apt to raise indignation, and to that end ingenuously

genuinely used, to wit, that *he will chuse rather to lose the exercise of his Ministry for a season, rather than make good use of Simeon's.* He does well to put in the word *for a season* to excuse it; for suppose this man under no such University Oath (as in our case we are not, I hope) could he indeed with a good conscience, give up his Ministry, rather than from a Master of Arts, become a Bachelor again? Is this a reason sound enough for so great a matter, because he will not abase himself to a lower degree for a moment in the Church, then he is already? There is certainly no bottom here. This sober man would not indeed have all his brethren, that are tender herein, to go presently out of the Vineyard, to accompany him, would he? Suppose a Minister, say suppose twenty that do much good in their place, yet being sensible of the burden of their calling, and made more tender by him, shall be glad now of his book and example, and so satisfy their consciences, to leave their charge, and give off; will this bring any real pleasure and solid content to this man's heart, and can he comfortably rejoyce in it before the Lord, to hear of it? Alas! that the grand interest of Jesus Christ should lye no more near some of the best of his servants, that they should bring it so easily to the stake? Must a Christian many times be content to become a fool, what if for once, he submit to be made so, for Christ's sake? Sir! though you would not undervalue your self for a fellowship with Simeon in the College, I hope you will be content to lose some degrees of reputation and estate too, to continue with Simeon in the Temple waiting for the consolation of Israel.

For the fourth Question and Responses. This one thing is plain at the first sight. Here is the part of the Bishop and the part of the Minister, and each one is to look to his own part. For the Minister, let him be serious and carefull of what he says for himself, so as to be sure he does not in the least offend his conscience; which he shall not doe if he purposes and endeavours to perform what he promises; if perhaps his soul is tender herein, as to some passages in regard of the pious sense of his frailty, as when the words run *strict, Will you use all endeavour to do thus and thus*, and the answer is, *I will do so*; what if for *I will*, he somewhere say *I desire*? More particularly, when the duties of the Deacon are proposed and he considers that upon his

his being Priest the proper work of that Office, which is inferior (and which he would not engage unto) does cease according to the plain Text, *Mat. 6. 3, 4, 5.* what if he alter the word so, and say *I will do what concerns me,* (or the like) and so likewise for other expressions. No Bishop (I hope) will find fault with such a matter. For the Ordainer, let him likewise consider well, that what he sayes and doeth be according to his own established judgement; for this rule, I must account equitable to both, that neither party are to account themselves responsible to God herein for the parts (words or acts) of the other, but their own. *When I joyn with a man in an action* (saith Mr. Burroughes) *I am to look to the action and principle that I go upon, but let him with whom I joyn look to the principle he goes upon. If he will goe on a false ground when he may go on a true, let him look to it.* Iren. p. 184.

And here I cannot but be sorry to hear how it hath fared with some in our case, they have been loath to tell the Bishop that they were ordained before, and he hath been loath to know it; but if they will be ordained, he will ordain them. This is not fair play: He should enquire whether they were so or no, and if they were, let him endeavour to convince them if he can of the nullity of their former Orders, if he cannot, let him hear their reason why they submit to be Re-ordained. When this is done, I will suppose the Bishop keeps his mind, and so tells a man plainly, that for as much as he is his Ordinary, who ought not to allow of any to exercise the Ministry without Orders, and he for his part does believe in his Conscience, that all Orders by Presbytery only is null and void, and therefore for the satisfaction of him, his Bishop, and of others, and the present Church, he requires this same of him. This is plain dealing from him. The Minister I will suppose likewise to remain of the same mind, and he still declares his former Ministry to be valid, yet in regard that he is fully perswaded that Re-ordination is no where forbidden by Gods word, and our Rulers are to be obeyed in indifferent things, and this conduces more-over, or is made necessary to the exercise of his Ministry where he is called, he does upon this account yield to the same. This is plain also. Here is plain dealing on both sides: Now it was the saying of one very grave Bishop (which I think fit his Brethren

thren should know) in the case to one after some such kind of debate, whom he spake to there about, *I will Ordain you in my sense,* (sayes he) *and you may be Re-ordained in your own,* (or words to that effect); which I mention and offer even for the most clear and honest determination of this matter, whereas if either side do hide, they can hardly come off with this soundness of mind, and wholeness of conscience.

In a Conference (as I have heard) between the Presbyterian and present Bishops, it was proposed for an Accomodation in this case, that an Hypothetical forme might be used, *Si non ordinatus sis, &c.* I perceive my Author (p. 3.) would hardly have been content with this, *If there could be an invincible doubt whether a man were de facto ordained or no,* then he could belike approve hereof, and not else; but he looks not here half way to the bottom. A man may be sure he was ordained, and yet be in doubt whether his ordination by Presbytery be valid: But I will suppose a man assured of the one, and fully perswaded of the other, yet had this Accomodation been good; because this Hypothetical forme, we are to conceive, not directly to regard the Conscience of the party to be Re-ordained, as in doubt of his former Orders (for then the salve would not have reach'd near the soar, when there is not one of a hundred doubt of any such thing) but to regard the judgement or opinion of the Presbyterian and Episcopalian in generall, and consequently the judgement of each Bishop and particular party in the case: The one holds Ordination by the Presbytery only, to be null, the other holds it valid; neither side are like to be convinced by, or yield to the other, but must leave it, who are in the right, to the great Judge: In the mean time, the mutual condescension on such a forme by either party, prejudices neither opinion or cause, and yet the practise of the thing on both is agreed. From which way then proposed for a decision, I shall gather this one thing which is manifest, that Re-ordination must not be looked on (by those wise men that made this proposition) as a thing unlawfull in it self, but such as might be done, only the inconveniences (that it might not be injurious to our former Orders) be avoided, which when they cannot be by that way which took no effect, I offer it to the considerately judicious, whether the same thing in the substance is not done by what I

have been saying down, to wit, by the Ordainers and Ordained
 the Dictation of their conscience (or account upon which
 they sit) one to another.

I come now to those words in the forme, which are the chief
 soar, *Receive the Holy Ghost, Take thou Authority.* These words
 cannot be said to us who have the Ministerial power and Office
 already, sayes my Adversary, and that indeed is the core that
 sticks in most throats. There are severall things therefore I will
 speak to this, for one thing sometimes takes with one, and ano-
 ther with others. It is but words however we see, is stood upon,
 as for the thing it self it is wonne.

1. Let us know then, this forme *Receive the Holy Ghost*, hath
 been ever excepted against (since our Church hath been Prote-
 stant) by some Learned men. *Papisticum quidem ritus suliè quidem
 ab illis, & sine ulla scripturæ fundamento institutus, & à discipline nostre
 auctoribus non magno primum iudicio acceptus minore adhuc in Ecclesia
 retinetur, Ecclesiast. discip. p. 53.* as Hooker quotes it. Our Presby-
 terians accordingly we know have avoided such kind of words
 in their Ordination, (which are not expressly mentioned in any
 ancient Author to be used for a thousand years, sayes one) so
 that this scruple if it be any thing, will lye upon others that are
 ordained but once, as well as us; and our ancient Presbyterians
 (even the most rigid of them) themselves, if ordained in our
 Church, must come to the bar also, who did heretofore submit
 to the laque. The result whereof then must be this, that though
 the Church perhaps might do well, to examine these words,
 whether better expunged or not, yet if she does retain the same,
 her sons are to look on their part to be but passive herein, and
 leave the justification on her score.

Let us take it for most just and allowable, that these words,
 seeing they have been so much called in question, be permitted a
 free interpretation; and as the Bishop may take his, if we may
 but have ours, there will be no prejudice at all in them. By the
 Holy Ghost, as Christ used the words at first, Jo. 20: I am per-
 swaded is meant clearly, *the promise of the Spirit* he had told them
 of, and what that was is declared fully, Act. 2: at the day of Pen-
 tecost. I know it is said, that the manner of delivery *Receive*,
 does inferre something else then that, at present conferr'd; but
 is meerly a handsome gloss, which yet some answer, *sic datus
 fuit*

*fuit Apostolicus spiritus hoc loco ut esset dominatus furor, et non
plene ejus virtute imbuti.* This I will say, if we may but be so
bold to think that the Holy Ghost is not given by the Bishop
here, as it was given by Christ by his Disciples, then must we
have the liberty of our own sense in the thing; and what
then, if by the Holy Ghost we understand nothing else but what
is most genuine to any indifferent person, to wit, his more spe-
cial presence for support and assistance of us in our Ministry;
who does not see the words to be inoffensibly compatible to
our case as others? *Neque dubitari potest* (says Arch-deacon
Mason) *quin singulari quodam modo, praesto illi fuerit ipse Spi-
ritus sanctus ad idus dirigendos, sustentandos, assistendos, sicuti Christus
promissionem, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad finem saeculi. Hoc
spectat egregium illud S. Leonis dictum. Quis mihi poterit esse adiutor,
ipso fiet administrationis adiutor.* De Min. Ang. l. 5. c. 10.

3. To deal faithfully, let us consider what that sense of these
words is which is or hath been most current with our Bishops
and Church themselves. The holy Ghost essentially we know is
every where, and so not to be given; There must then I edum be
necessarily here, a Metonymy *efficientis pro effecti.* The effects of
the holy Ghost are various; The effect they would have, is such
as they may hold *de presenti*, alwayes, and certainly conferred
hereby to make the rite significant to purpose. The ordinary
effects now for which the Spirit in Scripture is taken, are his
graces, or gifts; For his grace, they will not say, they do confer
that (I take Grace strictly, for else any thing from Gods good
will may be called grace;) For Gifts, they are more wise too,
then to tyethem hereto, any more then Grace; There is some
effect else therefore must be found out, and that is, power; Re-
ceive the holy Ghost; with them then, is a power from the holy
Ghost, and this power specified by the next words *Whose power
you forgive, &c.* that is a power to forgive sins. So Hooker p. 412.
and Mr. Mason (those two like famous sons of our Church) *Spi-
ritus sanctus hoc in loco potestatem spiritalem denotat qua peccata re-
mittuntur.* And so Bellarmine might be added and more inci-
ent anchorours. And this I hope will help my adversary to his
full weight, if he can but really understand with such, and be-
lieve that this sense is not strained and forc'd. To this then I
have distinguished for the purpose, between the part of the Bi-
shop and Minister; These words we know are delivered by the

Bishop, and as they belong to his part, let them be put upon his account, and he will justify them in this sense. He believes our former ordination to be null, and so pronounces them to us, as if we had none of this spiritual power derived to us before, and as if he did now give it us hereby. And this we may suppose too he speaks truly according to his very conscience. Now if there was required any answer here again on our parts directly and clearly acknowledging the same, this were a scruple indeed to me invincible; but when there is nothing of this nature to be said by us, but the hearing only given to what he says, and the interpretation left free; Let us make the best of it, and lay not upon our selves what belongs not to our charge. And here that the faith of the Bishop may be strengthened (while it will stand us in stead) if he can believe such a thing indeed as will justify him in his own sense, the using these words, to wit, that our former Ordination is null; there is one plea I think of more moment for him then that only which is ordinarily urged, and this author hath confuted, (to wit merely that it was not done by a Bishop) and that is this: It is not only the Bishops, but the Presbyterians (who are against Re-ordaining) do hold that the Ministerial authority is conferred by Orders; Now in our Orders by Presbyters there was no word at all actually to convey this power, as there in the Episcopal Orders (according to them) do; and consequently they being destitute of their end, even that my Author also himself accounts the end, and only end thereof, they may if they can, think them null on that account. And I do remember I have noted one or two learned Authors somewhere pointing at this as a defect, and telling us that the Jews in the imposing their hands on their Elders (from whence the apostles, it is thought, took the rite up) did use some words still, particularly to express the authority they did convey, intimating as if else it were scarce an ordination.

4 To follow this, whereas my Opposer does not only suppose, but seems to believe, and argue upon it (even altogether) that the Ministerial power is indeed conveyed hereby; as our Bishops think themselves; I will ask him, whether he thinks, if these words were not used, that power which they impart, were given without them, Yea, or No? If he thinks No, then must his Ordination I say by Presbytery be null, where no such words

of giving authority was used at all, and he be re-ordained upon that score: If he thinks Yes, yet holds as he does that Orders give it, Why should a rite so material and significant be omitted before, and the defect not be supplied by a new solemnity, and so that at least, in *Gregories Decretals* take place? *In talibus non est aliquid iterandum, sed cautè supplendum, quod incautè fuerat prætermisum.*

6. But to set us upon our right bottom; when some Episcopal Divines do plead Ordination by Presbyters to be null upon that maxim, *Nemo dat quod in se non habet.* Mr. Baxter answers, p. 234. *It is the first error of the adversary to hold, that this power is given by men as first having it themselves.* So p. 147. *This falsly supposeth that the Ordainers are the givers of power, the master error in their frame; Christ hath it, and Christ giveth it: Men give it not, though some of them have it; for they have it only to use, not to give.* Let me say the same here to my present adversary, and I need say no more. If the Ministerial power be given by Orders, then are Orders of necessity to the being of the Ministry, but that Orders are not of absolute necessity *necessitate medi ad esse ministerii*, it is proved by that author (*cap. 3.*) beyond answer, as by *Votivum*, and others. The truth is, there is no Protestant Divine I know, but grant in *Ecclesiæ constituendâ*, or in a case of necessity a man may be a Minister without Orders; and if there were but one instance in the world where a mans ministry is valid unordained, the power is proved thereby to be immediately from Christ, and the *esse ministerii* not to depend upon ordination. I shall content my self with one instance, and that is of *Barnabas*, of whom we read in *Acts* 11. 19. that he was sent forth by the Church of *Jerusalem*, and then is ordained after with *Paul* at *Antioch*, *Acts* 13. 2. Now I demand, was *Barnabas* ordained before, or no? If he was not, then is not the Ministerial power given by, nor the being of the Ministry depend upon, Ordination: If he was, then have we here plain text and example for Re-ordination.

7. To understand this clearly, and more fully, though before touched The Ministerial power must be considered (as I have intimated) *Coram Deo*, or *Coram Hominibus*; when a man hath Gods gifts, and a heart to devote them to the use of the Church, it is Christs will he should be his Minister, and as his will makes it his duty, it must give him right and power; now

when the man hath this, it is his will moreover that these gifts be approved, and power declared, by the Church, that he may be received as his Minister or Embassador, by men, and those particularly unto whom he is sent. This is done by this Solemnity, this is one end and proper nature of it; and so the authority he had before *Coram Deo*, is made current *Coram Ecclesia*, and he reputed and passed streight by all, amongst the Order (as we call it) of the Clergy. Understand me I pray here: The authority of the Ministry *Coram Deo*, and *Coram Homini-bus*, I count not two authorities, but the same, one Spiritual authority, which being derived to a man from the standing act of Christs will in his institution, immediately upon his inward call, in the Court of Heaven and his own Conscience, does not yet passe in the Court of the Church, till this call be approved and confirmed by her Pastors, which she requires for Orders sake, and calls Ordination. And here now is a firm and true foundation laid against that Objection, which is apt to rise upon us, that if the Ministerial power flows immediately from Christs charter and call, then may any man pretend hereunto, and take upon him to be a Minister without Orders, which were to open the door to Fanaticism and Confusion: But God forbid we should not be able to put a bar upon such, which we can clearly maintain; It is this, to wit, that whatsoever a mans call is in the sight of God, the Church is to take no cognizance of it, untill by some of her chief appointed Pastors to that purpose, it be approved, testified, and declared by this Solemnity. If a man hath indeed abilities and a heart for Christs service, then is he bound to submit them to trial, and get them allowed; if he does not, he sins, and the Church is to take no notice of him till then (1 Tim. 5. 22. 1 Tim. 3. 10.) so that you may see how the actual exercise of a mans Ministry does depend (even altogether) hereupon, though the power does not, and that Text made good *How can they preach except they be sent*, in this sense of the words they are ordinary used, whether truly or no, I here say not. Let a *David* be excommunicate for Adultery, he shall be held *Coram Ecclesia* out of the Church, as well as an *Achan*; let a man be truly called, while his calling is not approved by the Church, (which is by Orders) we shall not account him a Minister any more then he that is not called, and if a man be not called, yet if he be ordained,

deined, his Ministrations are not to be doubted of as valid to
 the Church, while he is to repent of his bad Conscience before
 God. To give more life to this: As what hath been said may
 appear from its own light, so will it appear more fully from
 the tale of necessity, wherein the validity of the Ministry with-
 out Orders is agreed to by all. If the Ministerial power did not
 come to a man *Coram Deo*, so that he is a Minister in Gods sight
 before Orders, then could not necessity dispence with them, be-
 cause necessity falls not upon God, *there is no impossible with him*.
 But when the authority orders give, is only this authority *Co-
 ram Hominibus*, that is the reception or acceptation thereof with
 men: (the value or esteem of us as Ministers at the Churches
 bar, in their sight or account, what we are in Gods before) let a
 man plead impossibility, whether natural (as suppose him among
 the *Indies*) that he cannot be ordained; or moral (suppose
 him among the papists) that he cannot without him: against his
 conscience; this plea, *Nemo tenetur ad impossibile* is good at
 mans bar, for upon mans necessity does come, and he is to be
 dispensed with, and his ministry therefore to passe, which else
 in *Ecclesia recte constituta* were to be quite refused for orders
 sake. I cannot omit here one simile to the same point, which is
 laid down strongly by Grotius, De Imp. p. 270. *Potestas maritalis
 est a Deo; applicatio ejus potestatis ad certam personam ex consensu
 utriusque; quoniam ipsum jus non datur. Nam si ex consensu daretur,
 posset consensu etiam dissolvi matrimonium.* For my part I cannot
 but conceive thus; A man and a woman consents in their
 hearts, and privately give the same to one another; This con-
 tract between themselves makes them husband and wife before
 God, and his standing Law conveigheth to the man his power,
 and obligeth both to their duties: yet are they not to live
 together before marriage, if it were only for the shame, or sake
 of the world, besides that it is their duty hereupon (as mat-
 ter of publick order) to seek the matrimonial investiture
 which is valid according to the land: so is it here, when a
 man in the Gods sight does consent secretly between him and
 his soul to dedicate them to his service, the same standing law
 or will of his in his world or institution about this matter, does
 make it his duty and give him power; yet is he not to have the
 exercise of it, before this investiture of Orders; not only be-
 cause of the bawdry of the Ministry that will else follow, when
 men

men shall be received without tryal and approbation; Nor only because God commands this as his duty, so that he gives (if it may be had) to neglect it; but because the Church or People are not to receive or account such as Ministers, as they will not a couple man and wife, till the Solemnity. *Let these also first be proved, then let them use the Office.* In short (as at first) They may be both (I suppose) held to be *coram Deo* upon consent only *what* they are not *coram hominibus* before public confirmation.

8. However we understand these words, this methinks might give a reasonable man satisfaction, that it fares with us, but as with the Apostles themselves; Christ had before given them ministerial power, for they did preach and baptize while they continued with him, *Jo. 4. 2.* and yet does he use this same form of words, that seems no lesse than a new Commission. Nay that which is yet more, as Christ used this form but once, and that at their second mission; So is it with us, the Presbyterian used it not at first, and we have it without repetition.

9. I will suppose what is supposed, that *Receive the Holy Ghost* is equivalent with *Take thou Authority*, and understand it of the ministerial power, and consequently that there is moreover here a formal delivery of that Authority or Office to a Person, so that he may be said to be made a Minister thereby as he was not (*eo modo*) before; and yet let us but understand also this aright as we ought, that it is all done only by way of external investiture or solemnization as it is in the inauguration of Princes (who are said to be made Kings when they are Crowned or Annoynted) and there is no hurt at all comes to our Cause at last; which from thence indeed may have but the more clear demonstration, how the thing may without any absurdity in the world be done more than once. This I take to be the common Protestant doctrine, and rest upon it.

There remains now but one thing more, that after all this may beget some scruple, and that is, the instrument of our Orders. There is that of the Deaconship, which if one does not like, he may be civil to the Bishops Officers, and leave. For the other of Presbyter which is needfull for him to have, if it will not satisfy him, that they are the Bishops words, not ours, I will suppose he hath declaimed himself before, and the instru-

ment

ment is in his own hands. I shall say no more, but for my own part my Orders of Deacon (as quite uselesse otherwise) I thought good to cancell, before whom it seemed to me fit, in testimony of my owning my former Ministry; and for those of Presbyter which I keep, if any should chance to see them, they may find these words, in the backside, or bottom of them. *I was ordained to long since by a Classis of the Presbytery, and doubt not therefore of being a Minister before; yet do these Orders make me secundum ritus ecclesie Anglicanae Canonicè & legitime (according to this express tenour) as I was not before, and in that sense only have I submitted to the same.*

To conclude, If there was another form whereby our Ministry might be confirmed, or some Bishops would vary this to serve a private turn, then were the *Items* my Adversary hath given us sufficient, to make us to choose and seek that rather than yield hereunto, for so far does his arguing reach, even in full force: but while there is no such thing to be had, it makes it methinks a very high imagination, ever to enter the heart of a serious Christian, if he can find it there too, to have his Brethren of the same mind with him, to think, that he, and they should be ready to leave their holy Function and Charge (without some other conjoynd grand reason) rather than to bear with a little unhandfomness from our Superiours (for their Constitution's sake) in the impropriety only of a formality which is not neither a matter of worship, and so as it is said of Daniel, a matter of our God, but a matter, or ceremony of Order only. We can never indeed be too tender of displeasing the Lord, but let us take heed, we do not displease him by our fear that he will be displeased without reason from his Precepts, *Is. 29. 13.* Alas! What do we make of God Almighty? I cannot but call to mind a passage of *Plutarch (De Superstitione)* where he is saying, that that man is lesse impious: *qui opinatur nullos esse deos; quam qui tales esse credit quales superstitiosus.* I had rather (says he) it should be said there is no *Plutarch* at all, quam hoc dici, esse *Plutarchum*, hominem ad iram promptum vindictæ ob levisimas causas cupidum, ob minima queque indignantem. Do we believe God indeed is gracious, kind, and most wisely tender to his Children, and can we think that when he bears with their infirmities, he will not consider reason, and their necessity? The Lord Jesus we know did ex-

pressly excuse his Disciples breach of the Jews Sabbath, and *David's* eating the Shewbread, so long as there was occasion. Substantial duties must overrule Ceremonials. And if we may guesse by this, and *Paul's* conforming for his Ministry's sake, so often to the Jews, there is haply much more may be submitted to, than some think in the case of superiour reason. Let a man tend the main at his heart God hath set him upon; and he is not like to be unaccepted in these matters. See 1 K. 15. 5. 2 Ch. 30. 19. Mar. 9. 13 Neither are we to conceive under the Gospel, that the Lord hath enjoyned every thing to a pinne as in *Moses* Tabernacle. When some good men shall come to have more noble and evangelical apprehensions of the Almighty, and have routed their thoughts but once over the severall formes, rites or modes he hath been a serving withal; for these sixteen hundred years all abroad the whole Christian world, they may perhaps be brought to blush inwardly at the poornesse of such understandings, that would narrow the infinite to their completions. He hath shewed thee O man what is good, and what doeth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.

SECTION IV.

HAVING demolished these two Forts in general which are the shelter of my adversary, there are two arguments only in particular which he offers, the one is, from authority, and the other from the third Commandement.

For authority He first quotes the 67. Canon of the apostles which I have my self mentioned. Unto which, I shall only produce him by way of answer, another of the same. *Presbyter ab uno Episcopo ordinetur*, Can. 2. Here I must put himself upon a solution if he comes off in another question he handles in his book which concerns others; and he hath done it effectually, by a verdict of a Synod of Rome: it self, An. 494. that these Canons nullatenus recipit Catholica Ecclesia. He pleads farther, the practise of our English Church, which does not re-ordain a popish Minister; nor those formerly that were ordained beyond the

the Seas; unto which he addes the story of Archbishop Bancroft (which you may read *Sporwood Hist. of Scot.* p. 514.) and also that the episcopally ordained were not constrained by the *Gallican* and *Belgick* Churches, to be re-ordained after the mode of their Churches. As to all which, I account it were good for some of more skill in the history of latter times then I, concerning things of this nature to give us a relation of what hath been done in this case. There hath been examples no doubt of some that have, & some that have not been re-ordained. That which I say to this argument meerly of practise herein, is, that it does truly seem very pressing on the part of our rulers and imposers, but as for the part of the submitter, I cannot for my part but freely believe, that any, or either of these mentioned, might be ordained again if the exercise of their Ministry depends upon the same; and so I give in my answer. From a *non solet*, to a *non licet*, is a *non sequitur*. And here I will not omit one pertinent relation. A present grave Minister and of note in *Northamptonshire* (I have no commission to print his name) being ordained in the *Low Countries* came to Bishop *Lavenant* he told him that they held his ordination valid; neverthelesse in regard of his settling in the Ministry here, he thought it good before they parted, to ordain him again himself, giving him liberty in the point of Subscription, and what Indulgence else he desired I hear not. This instance is singularly full to my purpose, and being in a Bishop who was so eminently a solid and pious Doctor, cannot but at the very sight, remove some prejudice as to my opinion, and indeed as I hear, hath prevailed (it may be more then such an argument alone *de exemplo* ought) upon many. Let our Church Rulers be pleased but to tread in these steps, that is, declare our former Ministry hitherto to be good, require a new only *ad presentem statum*; by the way of confirmation, vary a few of their expressions (where they see fit) accordingly, and give a like indulgence as this above, in such circumstances as they find doe afflict any that are tender in conscience. and then I suppose both my brethren and I, and they and we, may soon come to composition in this controversie.

For the third Commandement, his other Argument, it is the same and no other then what I have laid down my self in my first sheets, to wit, the second Objection there, which one would have thought might have saved my Opponent his la-

bour, as to the half of his work; for it is this one thing upon the matter is the substance of his Book, upon my question; wherein, as soon as a man hath turn'd over any leaf that concerns me, he may guesse what will be objected against me before hand; The form namely, and the Ordinance in vain; that is, more words perhaps, but this Argument still for the main; *one light* in a several change; the old Moon and the new Moon, but the same.

I must confesse when the objection at first came into my mind in those sheets (where I fetch what I have only from my own spirit as I go along) it did lye fore upon it a good while, but I must needs say also, that the answer there I give to it, was as fully satisfactory to me as that was pressing before, and I did think it would be so also to others, or else those sheets might hardly have passed my hands. It does therefore now stand me upon (though I have spoke to this there so largely already, and have some things also before which might be sufficient) to gather up together all the forces that I have had, or further have, to fight as it were at once, *neither with small or great* in comparison, save with this his King, or master-argument he relies upon in this matter.

He that is ordained (sayes he) with a valid ordination, ought not to be reordained, because by submitting thereto, he doth take an ordinance of God in vain. This he proves. To take an ordinance for no end, or for no such end as God hath appointed it unto, is to take it in vain. But to be reordained, after preceding valid ordination is to do so; because ordination is to set us apart to the office of the Ministry, and we have the *xarisma* already. This is his marrow, without the exact writing out more of his words, which I hope neither he nor I care to stand upon in this dispute; Unto which I have therefore many things to say, for when I have in effect but one thing to speak to, there are many things I must needs speak to it.

1. There is a passage in an Author whom he elsewhere names with honour (as he is worthy) which I will set down in the first place, because I cannot chuse but receive it. We have no ground to think that the Apostles had any peculiar command for laying on of hands upon persons in prayer over them, or ordination of them, but the thing it self being enjoined, the setting some apart for attendance on the Churches by them planted, they took up and made use of

a laudable rite and custom then in use upon such occasions: Mr. Stillington, *Iren.* p. 270. Now though Doctor *Sehman*, Mr. *Lyford*, and the London Ministers (to whom my Opposer turns us) may have spent their pain well to prove that no man may ordinarily enter the Ministry without Orders, while as Calvin hath it, *illa Apostolorum accurata observatio* ought to be *Præcipienda* to us; Yet is there doubtlesse some difference to be put between such Ordinances, which Christ Jesus our Lord hath left from his own mouth to his Church, as Episcopacies, and such as the Apostles took up themselves from the present Custom of the Jewes; and we follow for their example.

2. I have distinguished plainly in my Book between our Ministry, and the use and exercise of it: I deny that Ordination is in vain, which is not to the *exercise* of Ministry it self, And the reason is irrefragable, because a man may be a Minister already and yet be ordained, as the case was with *Paul* and *Barnabas*. *Act.* 13. which our Author himself opens, enlarges and grants, p. 4. I will put this in other words, Ordination is either to the office or to the work; Now I deny our Author his definition, *Ordination is the setting a man apart to the work and Office of the Ministry*, (in the sense he understands *separating a man to his office*) for we have but one place only, from which we gather this *Genm* definition; that Orders is a separating or setting a man apart, to wit, that in the *Act.* *Separata* *no Paul and Barnabas*; and there it is manifestly to the Work only, and not the Office which they had already, as himself, and I argue upon it; and I lay as the sure foundation of our Case. It is true, that the Office (for *exercise*, if you call that so) cannot be renewed or repeated; but the Work may, the Work is. And if this pious man would not dislike it (as he says P. 47) if our Bishops when any are removed to a new Charge would call the Presbyters, and commend such to the grace of God for their Work by the imposition of hands, supposing that Text *Act.* 13. (which I mainly rely upon) be warrant sufficient for the same, it is not to be thought but another, who is; I will suppose just so much byassed towards the other side as he is toward his own, or posited equally, should think as but a small matter to be content moreover, that they use their own form, seeing they have yet no other, and our Reverend Episcopal men do not we know use to do such things as those without their Order appointed. Nay if this

may be done, as to the Work renewed in another place, why not I pray also as to the Work repeated in the same? supposing at least a man shall not be permitted to use his Ministry without it, and otherwise I perswade not the tender to it.

3. There is more here barely than this. The exercise of our Ministry is not to be considered at large, but restrictively, as to our Church. There is our Ministry, and use of it (I have said in my Book) in our English Church. It is to the last only I count we are re-ordained. To which purpose we must distinguish of those words of our Authors [after preceding valid Ordination] Ordination is valid either in *foro Scripturarum*, which is *vera* only: Or in *foro Episcopali sive presentis Ecclesie*, which is *legalis*, and Canonical also. Our preceding Ordination is valid (we believe) in the first sense, but in the second sense, our preceding Ordination is not valid, and so it is we are re-ordained. I return therefore the Argument; If when a mans former Ordination is valid, he may not, when it is not valid, he may, be re-ordained; but our former Orders are rendred by the change of the present times to be invalid, in the sense mentioned, and consequently in that sense may we take new, and in that sense the form proper thereunto methinks also be born. Our Ministry was the same *Silver* under the Prebytery, but the Canonical *Stamp* by the Bishop, makes it received according to the constitution of the present Church; Even as the *State-money*, though current before, must submit to be new coyned for all that; or else now it will not goe.

4. I say farther hereupon, Our taking new Orders is not then the taking an Ordinance to no end, nay it is a taking them to a right end, the very end which by Orders is to be had: Ordination (this Author will say) is a separating a Person to God. For what now I pray? why for the Work no doubt whereunto he is (or shall be) called. So in the Text *Ab. 13.* The use then, and exercise of the Ministry, is the end to which a man is ordained. I will explain it by a clear place, *Numb. 8. 11.* *They shall offer the Levites before the Lord*, compare it with *ver. 14.* and it is, *Thou shalt separate them*, that is their Consecration; Well mark then what follows, *that they may execute the service of the Lord* There is the end. And so *ver. 15, 22* *After that they shall go in to do the service of the Tabernacle.* Now

have said, though a man cannot be Re-ordained to his Ministry, (which he hath already) yet may he, to the use or exercise of it, to wit, that he may go into the Tabernacle, that he may execute the service of the Lord. You will say haply, these Levites and the Ministers are to be consecrate here to have their rights to, or liberty of doing their holy service in respect of God, because God requires this before they enter upon their work; but we are separate again now only in respect of man, because he requires it, or else will not allow this right and liberty to the same. I answer, this is true, and therefore let the Requirers look to it, when a person is consecrate already to God, and thereupon he expects his service from him, if man will hinder, let him see how he can answer it; but as for the Submitter, this is manifest, that whether he does this in conscience to Gods command (as he must) at first, or in obedience to his Superiors, in the doing it again, yet is the end in both the very same, and that is only what is most just and honest, that he may execute the service of his God, that he may have the free use of his Ministry in his place. And whether my Author dare say this is to no end, or not to the end proper to it, I leave it to his own breast to judge.

5. There is not this one end only in Orders to separate or set a man apart for his work, but others also, to wit, there is the invocation of Gods blessing upon us, assistance and grace with us in our work, which is so certain and plain, that when the Holy Ghost had said in one place *separate to me*, in another he tells us, *they were commended to Gods grace. Quid aliud est munus impositis nisi oratio super hominem?* says Sr. Austin, as he is quoted *De Baptis. contra Don. l. 3. c. 16.* Now this end is repetible I hope, and if there was nothing else, does alone take off the keenness of my Opposers edge. The Church I think may say her Prayers over twice, when Christ said the very same words thrice, *Matth. 26. 44.* But to speak exactly, and to the touch of the word and truth, the separating a man to God for his work, and sanctifying him by Prayer, is indeed the very same. There is therefore another end, arising from the nature of the Solemnity that stands me in most stead: Ordination I have said does not give the *jaw* or spiritual power to a Minister before God; what then, (it may be demanded) does it give? why truly I have said it, and it is so; It does give him his power or authority before men.

mon, (that is, his authority comes hereby to be received) It does give him the repute and value of a Minister; as to all intents in the Church. And now for as much as a man cannot reap this effect by virtue of his former Orders he already hath, there is (as I have said, and must say still) the very same ground at this season for Re-ordination, as for Ordination at first. Let my Reader see my first sheets from p. 32. to 37. and though this Gentleman hath quite waived all that concerns this, I must confess my self, (next to the plain Texts, *Act. 13. 2. Mat. 28. 19.*) I place my chiefest strength there.

6. Where things are not unlawfull, nor forbidden by God, why is it not an end sufficient for what we do, to obey our Superior, and that they have their end in it, supposing them (as in charity we are bound) good men, and that they aime at Gods glory in their commands? Nay, why is it not enough to follow prudence, what we judge most expedient, to study peace, to further our own and our neighbours good? Are not these honest and justifiable ends? It is true indeed, if a thing have evil in it, a good end will not justify it, unlesse that evil does cease to be so in the comparision; but I cannot lightly see evil in that thing which is neither against the light of nature, or positive institution. Let me adde more particularly: In things which are at our Liberty, a man is not to walk only after his own conscience, but to have respect also to the conscience of those with whom he is. *Conscience I say, not thy own but of the others*, 1 Cor. 10. 29. Thou art free for thy own part, as to the use of thy Ministry upon thy former Orders; but some persons, perhaps thy Friends, perhaps of chief note in the Parish, perhaps such as live up according to their knowledge, and indeed fear God, do think in their consciences that you are not such a Minister as you should be, unlesse you have Orders from the Bishop, and whilst their consciences are such, they scruple really, and so haply cannot act in Faith, to joyn with you in some Ordinances, as the Sacrament, and the like. Here are they distressed: They may not neglect their duty, and yea if they do it while they doubt it unlawfull to partake from you, they sin, because it is not in Faith. Now if by thy yielding to this matter, thou canst bring satisfaction to their consciences, and so gain them hereto, why is not this end such as is warrantable for thy

thy submission? Nay if thou wilt not do it, why may they not say *Now walkest thou not charitably that seekest only thy own and not thy peoples satisfaction. Even as I* (sayes the apostle) *please all men in all things, not seeking my own profit, but the profit of many that they may be saved.*

7. An Ordinance which is taken the second time for the same end it was taken rightly at first, is not taken for no end, or for no such end as God hath appointed it unto; for it is taken to the end he hath appointed it. But such is our case in Re-ordination; It is taken for a solemn allowance or approbation of our Ministry, the recommending us to Gods grace for our work, the free passage of the Gospel; And where the ends are repeatible (as in preaching, praying, administering the Sacrament) and made necessary to be repeated, the means must be repeatible, and repeated also. I do therefore deny his argument, which is founded still on that only, that the ministerial power is conferred by orders, and that that is the the only proper end thereof, which is but a supposition. Whereas then he asks his friend, whether the *χαρισμα* the Apostle speaks of, was conveighed to him in his first Orders, and tells us thereupon, *ibi includere cum sacris, id habere the Bishop and his Chaplains pray that he may now receive that gift*; this I take it, is a passage too low for this author; for let him seriously but remind the thing, and it is not like our Church should passe such an escape as to compile a standing prayer for necessary effects, or accounted such; she may say in her ordering, *modo imperativo*, Take, Receive, the Ministerial power, but she does not pray *modo optativo*, that it may be given by the same.

8. As for the *χαρισμα* then, he mentions, which is spoken of *Timothy*, there is no man can certainly tell what that Gift is. It may be the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost given in those times, or some extraordinary talent at least not given to others. It is not unlikely, methinks, that *Timothy* might be so carefull and attentive upon the ordinary work of his proper charge, that the Apostle is fain to put him in mind that he wholly neglected his. It may be likewise some further degrees of study, or the decrease of the abilities he had, and so *Colum* hath it, *Drum cum lapsa cum uovis donis, vel priora duplicasse.* Now if either of these be the sense, as is most obvious, it is nothing for my ad-

versary. It may be also (to serve my Opposer) *deceñdi officium* as our London Divines, or the Ministerial function, as hee supposes it. Let us suppose this then with him (at least till wee come to see it more unlikely) yet so long as it is said directly of Timothy to be in him, or given him, by prophesy, that is, so full and expresse a signification of Gods will (which I have touched in my first sheets) as by Revelation: As the will of the Lord doubtlesse, and that alone must be the fountain of his officers power, and that being sufficiently signified must be enough to make a man his Minister; the imposition of hands that is mentioned besides, can conduce after this, no otherwise indeed, but by way of solemnization. And so Mr. Perkins sayes of the like case, Acts 13. *This imposition was rather a confirmation, then a calling.*

9. I remember amongst more impertinent things, that sometimes burdened my thoughts against Re-ordination, there was that text Deut. 12. 32. *What thing soever I command you, observe to do it, thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.* Unto which, though I had these many reasonings: That this text speaks of those precepts which were exactly commanded by God, but our matter is a ritetaken up by the apostles probably of themselves, as is noted as first; That God in Moses Law stood more punctually (we may think) upon the external performance then under the Gospel; That the thing we do metrically as it is, making no more nor lesse of it, apply we use it over again, and repetition is not addition, in the sense here at least, where it is opposed to diminishing; That the Text forbids doing any other thing then the same God hath commanded (as not to follow the Heathen in their Rites in the verses before) but it forbids not, the doing the same, upon occasion; yet did not all this give full contentment to my mind (being weak) untill that instance came into it, 1 Chron. 29. 31. where we have a speciall Ordinance of God, the Feast of unleavened bread, which was expressely commanded to be kept seven dayes, and it is said *the whole assembly took counsell, and kept seven dayes also.* Now unless we shall think that the whole assembly understood not the meaning of that Text, or else did wilfully break it, here is repetition exactly proved no addition to Gods Commandement. This instance therefore I will humbly advance

in this place, to the farther light and satisfaction of our case. Here is (we see) an appointment of God, one of their three most solemn Feasts; They had no precept nor president to repeat it; yet does the whole Assembly consult and approve it, and though they did it of their own heads, and meer good wills, and to the same end only it was instituted, and already performed, yet dare not my Adversary, I hope, accuse them in it of taking an Ordinance in vain, or breach of the third Commandment.

10. Let us know in the last place, that there are many things, especially in matters of Ceremony only, and Order, wherein an Ordinance or Ordinances may be used, not only without its principal, but without its proper end, in case it be directed to an end of an higher nature and concernment, to the honour of God, and advantage of the Gospel. Thus are those Synodical Rites prescribed, *Act. 15: 19.* Thus *Paul* keeps the Jews Sabbath, *Act. 13: 14, 42.* Thus *James* and the Elders advise *Paul* to conformity to the Law, *Act. 21: 20.* The great command which lies upon him, is to preach, and further the Gospel, *1 Cor. 9: 16.* The Jews are never able to abide him, if he be against their Ceremonies; Hence does he therefore take their advice, and purifies himself, shaves, wears, &c. *Sauiel* is commanded of God to anoint *David*; He fears if *Saul* hear of it he will kill him; upon this he pretends a Sacrifice and does it: Here is an Ordinance of God taken up for an end (we see) quite extrinsecal to it, yet is it justified by God himself, upon the account of his own Superior command, *1 Sam. 16.* The most remarkable instance of all, is the Apostles circumcising *Timothy.* *Act. 16: 3.* where I will ask, to what end did *Paul* do this? not I hope to the proper end of that rite, for that were deadly, *Gal. 5: 3. Gal. 2: 17.* but for the winning the Jews, the satisfying of them (*1 Cor. 9: 19, 20.*) the sake of the Gospel, *vers. 23.* And this I do for the Gospel sake. We see then that an Ordinance may be used, and yet not taken in vain, although it be not directed to that end which is properly appointed to, in the case of Superior command, or over-ruling reason.

There is some answer I find essayed to this by this Author, p 76. Circumcision, and these Rites, he counts well, are abolished since the death of Christ, and so I take it are called by the Apostle *Ordinances of men*, and *Rudiments of the world*, because held in use by man, when they ceased to be the precepts of God. Now if we should question whether an *abolished Rite* (or consequently a meer humane Ordinance) might be used without its end, only in order to the propagation of the Gospel, I perceive he would not gain-say it. But *Ordination* (says he) is not an *abolished Ordinance*, and to take an Ordinance of God which is in force, and make it serve another end then that to which it is directed by him, this he thinks (I suppose) not justifiable by *Timothies* circumcision. To reply, (besides what I have instanced in Gods advice to *Samuel*, which cannot therefore be evil) we must distinguish here between the *Rite* it self of Ordination, and the *Forme* wherein it is wrapt. For the Rite it self, which is the Ordinance of God, (or rather an Apostolical practice we follow for their example) it is directed to its proper end, when we are Ordained twice, as when we are Ordained once, for we have the assistance of Gods spirit implored, or we are commended to the grace of God for our work thereby, as at first, and that is the principal end (not to name another) of this Rite, as it was Primatively used, if we will take the Holy Ghosts own thoughts of it, who hath described the thing clearly but once, and that is thus, *Act. 14. 26.* with *Act. 13. 2.* Yea, let a man only have a call to a new place, and my Adversary himself does fully consent with me in this. For the *Forme* then upon which he stands; It is true, that upon the common supposition, there are words that conferre the *Ministerial power*, (as he speaks) which cannot be directed to that end in our case. But besides, that this is a mistake (those words indeed being to be taken only as words of Investiture and Solempnity not efficacy, that is, declaring, not conferring of power) I say that the *forme*, this *Forme* upon which he so beats, is not the Ordinance of God, but is for certain mans compofure or invention, and so a humane Creature, or Ordinance

dinance of man; and consequently though it were granted that an Ordinance of God might not be used to any other end, but that to which it is directed by him; yet does our force from these instances remain, because that a meer humane Ordinance or Rite may, and he dare not gain say it. These Jewish Rites when abolished were Ordinances or Commandments of men, Col. 2. 20, 22. and they are so used by the Apostles. I will conclude with the mention to my Reader of a convenient Book at this time, to wit, Mr. Sprin his *Cassander Anglicanus*, and if he will but apply those Arguments he hath upon this head unto our single case, I believe he will hardly escape unsatisfied from him, who does labour upon this very account to maintain in general, that it is necessary for a Minister to conform to the Ceremonies prescribed in the Church of England, in the case of deprivation: And the Watchman said, If ye will enquire, enquire; return, come.

SECTION V.

THIS much for the Authors book it self, and I hope I have not barely skimmed over his words, but set my self to bestow my pains upon his substance, where the water sticks with him: And here perhaps some of his Brethren, when they see such a point as this managed in effect with the force only of one Argument throughout, (which therefore I have so solemnly stood upon at once) may be apt to impute it to barrenness, when others perhaps more solid, may take it but as a note of his judgement, that knows so well the very lock where indeed his only strength lies. I proceed to his Appendix, which he hath more particularly bestowed upon me in his courteous Animadversions; I shall therein humbly take the occasion of supplying further notes as I go the way along with him over my own Papers.

In the first Section he begins with the kind notice of the occasion that drew me forth on this subject, which I must commit to the Lord, who knows that many times the personal failings of some of his frail Creatures in those things which are perhaps lawfull in themselves, and good to others, may procure from him, the leaving them in those perplexities from which they cannot get out again, untill they have run the gantlop through those his providences which he hath appointed for them in the way to the shelter of their former quiet, and healing of his mercy.

I do humbly implore this in the first place, and must take notice at the beginning of some words of my own, where I speak of having made no use of the notions of others, I must except so much light (besides what else may be obvious) as I have in two parenthesis, (p. 33. and p. 83.) which fell in after I had done the rest, yet cannot pass without confession, and crave the Readers ingenuity. I have observed what a little escape sometime (as another would think) *Augustine* takes notice of himself in his Retractions.

For passing my judgement on Re-ordination, I laid down at first two distinctions. There are some things (I said) that are indifferent in their nature, so as in some case they may be done, and yet are by Divines indefinitely counted evil. And there is evil which is notional only, or moral evil. That which my Opponent says to this, is only that he quotes Dr. *Saunderson*, ingenuously intimating from whence I took my first distinction, and not disallowing my second, differs only in his verdict, that he accounts not this thing in the number of such indifferents, (so wit, *indifferentia ad unum*) but a thing unlawfull, and not an *imaginary*, but *moral* evil. He does not give us any reason here, *pro* or *con*, only passes to the next; but I desire my Reader to note I do not leave the business so, but when I have given in my opinion otherwise, I proceed in my discourse to lay down the nature of Orders, which I humbly offer as the free and open account for that my judgement. I have been therefore so large upon this before, as I must continue, and seeing this Author opposes nothing, but

but runs upon the common bias to the contrary, to wit, that Orders do give the Ministerial Authority and Office, which is not, I take it, well understood of those themselves that receive it. I shall seasonably take here into remembrance, those Arguments which the London Divines do offer for this assertion, and if they be answered, my Brethren I suppose will not be seeking to find out any more likely or solid, from others.

Their first Argument is this, If Election does not give the essentials of the Ministerial Office, then Ordination doth. I answer, As for those many eminent and learned Divines, besides the Ministers of New England, that do hold Election gives the Ministerial Office, and those worthy judicious Divines of London, that hold Ordination doth it, may I think both fairly part stake. When the former do say and prove that Ordination is but the confirmation of a man in his Office, not the giving the Office, I like well the liberty of their judgements; but when they have well taken from Orders this which is too high for man to assume, and give it to Election and the people, I understand not with them. It is Mr. Perkins Judge clearly in the right here, who hath told us, *Our calling is of God, and the Churches Authority is a Ministry to approve and confirm that call.* This I do assent to, in opposition to both of these Learned parties; to wit, that Ordination does not give the power or Office, but is only the confirmation of our call, against the one; and that that call is of our inward call by God, and not so low as the outward only of Election by the people. *Ordinatio non datur nisi publicis testimoniis et vocatione, in conspectu Dei & ipsius nominis, declaratur esse legitima, & divina,* sayes Charnetius. Unto which I will add one signal testimony, and that is out of the Confession of the famous Churches of Helvetia, speaking that the Ministerial charge is to be committed to such only as are found skillfull in the Law of God, of a blamelesse life, and to bear a singular affection to the Name of Christ. (the three things our Perkins before accurately teach) It follows, *which seeing it is the true Election of God, is rightly allowed by the consent of the Church, and by the laying*

laying on of the hands of the Priest, Harm: Confess. printed
Anglice Cambridge, 1661.

Their second Argument is from *Ti. 1. 5.* Ordination does
calascimus or *constituere*, they press the word *Ab. 6. 3.* I answer
this Text *Ti. 1. 5.* is paralell with *Ab. 14. 23.* (see *Fulk in*
locum) and In both the word *ordained* (though the Greek
differ) is taken comprehensively, as it includes election, and
so in those words *calascimus* whom we may appoint, the plu-
rall we includes (I think) those whom the Apostles speak to,
as well as themselves, and makes for us; for it follows then,
Ordination does *calascimus* or make a Minister, as
election does, and election is ordination, that is, they
do both go to the designation of the person, as in the
making Magistrates in Corporate Towns; but the power
does flow immediately from the Charter, from Christs in-
stitution.

The third Argument is from *Ro. 10. 15.* this sending (say
they) is *missio potestativa*, a sending with authority. I answer
it is true (compare *Jer. 23. 21.* with it) but this *authoritative*
missio, is not Ordination. This appears irrefragably by the
climax in the Text, themselves have noted, Without calling
upon the name of the Lord, no salvation; without faith, no
calling upon him; without hearing; no faith; without
preaching no hearings and without being sent, no preaching;
consequently if by *being sent*, is meant Ordination, it must
follow, without Ordination, no Salvation; which God
forbid, *Scripture* Histories are not wanting to tell us not only
of some persons, but people (as I remember) have been con-
verted by private Christians, and scattered Disciples which
have not been in order. (see *Theodoret lib. 1. c. 23. p. 4.*
Ps. 119. disproving the opinion of those that hold Or-
dination so necessary, *Ut citra eam non possit esse Ministerium in*
ecclesia, does quote, John the Baptist who preached and baptized,
and no doubt converted many, and Paul before the 13. of the
Acts, and Moses who consecrated Aaron and his sons and dis-
tributed *varia sacramenta* genera. (says he) and had no conse-
cration, *Loc. Com. De Ec. p. 89.*

The fourth Argument is from 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. This *χολπισμα* they say here is *Docendi officium*, for which they quote those two Texts, *Eph.* 4. 8. *Rom.* 12. 6. *Answ.* I must confesse I my self have been bended to this same conceit upon the score of the last Text; but when I have more narrowly consulted the same, I find that I and they have been quite out. The question is, whether the word *χολπισμα* may be interpreted Office? And if the Apostle does use it in that sense elsewhere, we shall be apt to believe it so here; if he does not, this belief will sink of its own accord. Now then if we look the first of these quoted Texts, we shall find the word there to be *δωματα*, and so is a plain mistake, that concerns not our search. For the other Text then, let us look into it, and we find the Apostle does distinguish *de industria* between the two words *χολπισμα* and *χολπς*, Gifts and Grace, and the one of them, according to the sense there, must signifie authority and office, and the other endowments or abilities for the same. Now which of the two words is it that signifies the former? Truly one might think at the first sight it were the first, being ready to read the sense thus, *Having gifts --- whether prophesie or ministry*, &c. making those latter words (which import Office) refer to Gifts: But when we look better, we shall find otherwise, and must read the sense of the words as in their own order they lye, to wit, *according to the grace given to us, whether Prophecy or Ministry*, &c. And so these latter words referr indeed to the word *Grace*, which is the truth. That this may appear, let us know, that *Grace* properly is Godstavour in general, and the word therefore is put in Scripture usually for several effects of it. Remission of Sin and Reconciliation is one effect of his favour, and that is called *Grace*; The internal habits infused, Faith, Repenrance, Love, &c. are effects of his favour, and they are called *Grace*; The Gospel is an effect of his favour, and that is called *Grace*, *the Grace of God that bringeth Salvation to all men*. So likewise is the putting a person into that Dignity to be one of his Ministry, an effect of his favour (and very great favour, if we can prize and use it right) and therefore the Office and authority of our Ministry is called *Grace* also, and so it is called *Grace* in the Text. I know not indeed of any that have said this before me, but I am confident I am in the right, as my eye sees, when the

Sun shines. We will compare it with one or two Texts else^d where, and no man shall be able to deny it. See *Rom.* 15. 15, 16. *I put you in mind because of the grace which is given to me of God, that I should be a Minister, &c.* So *Gal.* 1. 15, 16. with *Gal.* 2. 9. And in the same Chapter here, *Rom.* 12. v. 3. *I say, through the grace of God given to me, to every one of you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought.* What is that Grace there? but according to the authority I have as a Minister to rebuke and admonish such. And when we are come so high, no wonder if at the next breath as it were, the Apostle uses the word *χρεις* in the same sense, and consequently the word *χρεια* be the more certainly and strictly restrained to its proper sense, as distinguished here-from; so that the meaning of these words are, *Having endowments varying according to the office wherein he hath put us, let him that exhorteth wait on his exhorting, and he that teacheth on teaching, &c.* I conclude this grand Objection with a double Note (that I may be sure to run it quite through while I have it under my Pen, to trouble me no more as it hath done) 1. That the word *χρεια* then, being not used elsewhere in any sense, but that which is peculiar to it; as when we say *gifts of healing* (See *1 Cor.* 12. where it is often iterated) we are not lightly to believe that it should be taken in a forced sense here, without we had some support for it. 2. That so far as *χρεις* is the general word put for several of its effects in Scripture, and this *χρεια* is indeed one special effect in particular among them, distinguish'd by the Apostle himself from the rest, to wit, Qualification or Abilities (whether ordinary or extraordinary) for ones office, as it is never taken out of its proper sense elsewhere, so, for ought I know, it may not, without spraining the word quite, and puring its right foot out of joynt.

The last argument is from the great solemnity of the Ordinance, the eminency of the persons Ordaining, and the care they are to take in it: *1 Tim.* 5. 22. I answer, these particulars and the like, when they have enlarged them, may serve well to keep up the due credit there ought to be upon this solemn approbation of our Ministry by our Church Rulers, which, as God requires of them, lest unworthy persons should pretend his call and intrude; So does he of us (if any of us have indeed his call) both for the benefit or blessing
of

of those Publick Prayers which we do humbly expect as one expresse end of this Rite, and also for the procuring us our *reception* in the Church, which is another, a *Right* whereunto is derived to us by the same. I desire my Reader to mark this once for all, as a matter of more weight than haply he thinks of; It is not only that a man is hereby received as a Minister (which he *was not* before) but he hath hereby a right conferred on him to be received as such (which he *was not to be* before) by the Church in the free use of his Ministry, and the people, that the command of God does take hold on them hereupon, to render that honour and obedience which is due to him in his name, *He that receiveth you, receiveth me.* Which when it comes to be weighed, will I hope be accounted a very sufficiently competent end of mans solemnity. And thus much this last argument of these my Reverend Fathers and Brethren of *London* may help to maintain, but otherwise I suppose it proves nothing; Of whom therefore I humbly take my leave, craving their pardon, that when I have found naught here, to glean upon the Vine of my proper Opposer, I have *turn'd back my hand as a grape gatherer into their Basket.*

SECTION VI.

IN my second Section, After other Propositions for the deciding this matter, I distinguishing between what Ordination is required for the setting apart a man to the Office of a Minister in the sight of God (Let me adde, and give him the Right of reception according to Scripture with men) and what is requisite to the actual making him received as a Minister, and give him authority or full repute to exercise that office in the Church or place where he shall be called; or more short, between the Ministry, and use of that Ministry in the *English* Church: Ordination now I said by Presbytery only suffices to the one, but re-ordination by the Bishop is required to the other. I will illustrate it by an instance, Even as the anointing of *David* by *Samuel* in the House of *Jesse* was sufficient to set him apart to be *the Lords anointed*, or to make him King

before God, yet must he be annointed or inaugurated again in Hebron, to declare him King, and give him acception with the People: 1 Sam. 16. 11. with 2 Sam. 2. 4.

Let me note here, when I say Ordination does set a man apart for the Ministry, I mean not so as that it gives it him. I cannot but conceive that a mans Inward call must needs give him his Ministry, the *jus* or faculty, before God, as his Outward gives it him before men, that is, causes it to be received by them; and that there is consequently an Internal separation, when a man upon acknowledgement to God of his gifts, does seriously dedicate himself to this service before him, as an Outward and solemn by Ordination; which whether it be Presbyterian or Episcopal it is all alike as to what the word requires, but is not accepted alike in our present Church, which stands upon her proper form and mode of Government.

I will enlarge a little here. There is a Fundamental right as Presbyterians say, and I believe, in every Minister to Ordain others, according to that rule, which is dignified by a great Pen, *Ordinis est conferre ordines*. Nevertheless when the Church came to see it good, for the avoiding of faction, and keeping peace, to give a preheminance to the Bishop above the Presbyter, there is no reason, but the Presbyter, upon consent, might as to the actual exercise hereof, *de jure suo cedere*, so as to Ordain none without the Bishop, which coming more and more into debate, it is no wonder if you begin at the second Canon of the Apostles, and goe over all the Councils and Fathers, and find this still the allowed prerogative of the Bishop to have the power of Ordination, according to that which is so well known of Cassander. *Convenit inter omnes Apostolorum aetate inter Episcopos & Presbyteros nullum discrimen fuisse, sed postmodum Schismatis evitandi causa, Episcopum Presbyteris fuisse prapositum, cui chirotonia, id est ordinandi potestas concessa est*. Now forasmuch as the authority of Councils, or Fathers, is received or not received of particular Churches, according to their proper concerns and complexion; As Presbytery hath served her self of the Scripture, to the neglect hereof, It cannot be expected but Episcopacy should serve her turn likewise of Antiquity; which being added to present power, must needs discountenance other Orders, and if they come once not to be received and owned, the

the ground is laid for their refreshment or iteration.

I remember in the Council of *Nice* we have this Canon, *Can. 17. Si quis ausus fuerit aliquem qui ad alterum pertinet ordinare in sua ecclesia cum non habeat consensum Episcopi ipsius, & quo recessit Clericus, irrita erit huiusmodi ordinatio.* Let me ask here any Divine, Presbyterian or Episcopal, Suppose a man ordained by another Bishop than his own, and without his leave, is that man truly ordained or no? There are none in our dayes will deny it, and yet according to these Canons such a mans Ordination was null, and consequently if he would enjoy the use of his Ministry under his Bishop he must be re-ordained. Now let any learned man tell me how such Ministers in this case could submit to that Canon in those dayes (which no doubt but most did submit to, seeing that Council was so authenticke in the word) and then will our case be also opened and justified to my hands. In short, it is sufficient for the Church to receive a man as a Minister, that is Ordained only by the Presbytery, as of old by any Bishop as their own, according to Scripture, which knows no difference between Bishop and Bishop, or Bishop and Presbyter in this case, but it would and will not serve according to Ecclesiastical constitution.

Let us now see what my Opposer sayes here, and it is the same only he hath every where. *If the Presbyterian ordination leave a man not capable of having anything conferr'd on him but only the free use of his Ministry in the English Church, why will he submit to such a form as was purposely instituted to conferr the very Ministry it self? why are such prayers put up to God as suppose him to be no Minister?* This is answered already, and we see the *ARTIOUR* the same still.

There is no form to be conceived such, as to confer the Ministry it self unto any, or to put up Prayers, that a man may be made a Minister, as he conjectures and speaks, p. 68. I doe therefore produce him the very words of this form, to serve my turn. *Take thou authority to preach the Word, and minister the Sacraments where thou shalt be appointed;* which are so apt as if they were studied to ordain a man, not to the Office, but to the Work only of his place: Hereunto he candidly gainsays nothing, only tells us there are more words used than these, to wit, *Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins ye re-*

mit, &c. unto which words in particular, and the form in general, I have spoken at large at first: What I must say over again to answer him as I go along, is; Our Ordainers must not be look'd upon according to this Author, as Creators of the Ministerial power, which is given alone by Jesus Christ, but as the signifiers and approvers of his Will and Grant. There is indeed one grand Warrant (I must say) Commission or Charter from Christ in general, empowering them who are qualified, as his word describes, to be his Ministers. The Ordainers now are to enquire whether a person have these qualifications, that is, as it were, whether he be in the Commission, and then if he be found there, what they doe besides, is but the declaring this, by the solemnity. The Commission then or Ministry it self is from our Lord, and Orders doe but give the same its free passage in the Church where a man is. Now this passage is hindred by the change of the times, and therefore, *the Right Reverend* (as he speaks) is troubled to remove this hindrance, and so, *not to doe only what is already done*. He is troubled, not to make a man again a Minister of Christ, but a Canonical Minister (if you will) of our Church, that is, to make him passe for such according to their Lawes and Canons, when else he cannot pass, and therefore is this also done by that form so prescribed, the words whereof, which stick, we are to conceive with all forms of Orders else must be interpreted only, as I have said, to be declarative, not operative of our power, by way of investiture, possession, or solemnization. Even as it is in the inauguration of Princes, which as I have but now instanced in *David* above, and *Solomon* before, may be valid at first, and yet done over again, to establish them more formally or legally amongst their people.

I will take a little liberty here of more words. Ordination I count is the confirmation, declaration, and solemn allowance of a mans Ministry by our chief Pastors and Rulers, that may give us the value and reception as Ministers to all intents in the Church, particularly for the execution of our charge where we are. Now there being none according to the form of our *English* Church and Nation, of authority to doe this but the Bishops, though our former Orders have been sufficient hitherto, and are yet good as to our Right, yet growing insufficient (through this change) or enervate as to the effect, the re-

newal of them according to the present Polity (unless there be some myſterious danger in ſubmitting at all hereto) does become expedient to us, and obliging ; and obliging (without ſome other greater reaſon) becauſe expedient to us , for the ſake of the Goſpel.

To advance this yet farther : There be ſome learned men do give much here to the Magiſtrate. *Grotius* (ſaies *Mr. Baxter*) commendeth the ſaying of *Musculus* , that would have no Miniſter queſtion his Call , that being qualified, hath the Chriſtian Magiſtrates Commiſſion. I obſerve *Grotius* himſelf does allow Confirmation of a Miniſter , diſtinctly to the Magiſtrate ; and *Dr. Seaman* hath quored *Gerrhard* to the ſame purpoſe ; I might (I think) adde ſomething out of *Peter Martyr* , *Chemnitius* , and moſt others . Now if theſe great men held that Ordination made a Miniſter , the Magiſtrate could have no part aſſigned him at all about that buſineſs ; but if Ordination only declares a mans Miniſtry ; If it be Chriſt alone gives us our Office , and man only procures us an outward Authority for repute and reception as Miniſters in the Church where we are called (which I take it is true) then as I doe not doubt , but that upon ſuppoſition there were no Miniſters in a place to ordain, the Magiſtrates allowance is good : So do I propoſe it to be conſidered , whether the Magiſtrates appointing who ſhall be Ordainers, Presbyters, or Biſhops, may not ſtill determine the validity by either in the Church where he is Supreme ? and conſequently, though our Orders before were of force, now the pleaſure of our Law-givers is otherwiſe, whether we may not be re-ordained upon that account ? This I offer, becauſe there may be ſome conſciences perhaps that can ſet upon ſuch a ground as this, when they cannot otherwiſe, though I intend to lay no further ſtreſs upon it.

I return then to my Oppoſer, who (p. 67. 68.) is hunting ſome of my expreſſions, but ſhould do well to take the ſubſtance with them. I am in my laſt Propoſition , there prepoſing ſuch Scriptures which concern the fifth Commandment, Our Superiours are to be obeyed in all things, *1 Pet* 2. 13. *Col* 3. 22. This thing is what they require, and impoſe upon us ; and that I take therefore to be a plain ground for our ſubmiſſion. There is a late book of ſome tender and learned Divines, concerning the *interſeſt of words in prayer*, who when they have told

us, p. 72. that *what we call the Church of England, is nothing else than a company of men by a Civil Power made Bishops, and called to advise the State in things concerning Religion*, do add, p. 73. *We again say, far be it from us to oppose Civil Authority, either exercised by Lay-persons, or Ecclesiastical persons. We further say, we are bound to obey the Civil Magistrate in all things; in things lawful actually, in things unlawful by suffering.* I do note this passage as that which may do good to many, and tend to healing, when the rest of that book may make them but very sore; to wit, that though they should have received such prejudicate and hard thoughts of the Government by Bishops, as if they were anti-Christians, against their Covenant, or the like, yet may they see here, how, or under what notion they may obey them for all that; to wit, as the King is Supreme both in causes Ecclesiastical and Civil, the Bishops, I perceive, are taken with them for Magistrates appointed under him in the one, as the Judges & Justices are in the other, & so they allow obedience to them, as to other Superiours, so long as they require only things lawful; and that our matter in hand is such, it suffices. I count) that it is no where forbidden in the light of Nature or Scripture, directly or consequentially, and therefore it is lawful, for which I have quoted that known Text, *Where there is no Law, there is no transgression. In his rebus (says Austin) de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura, instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt.* That which can be supposed to be replied to this, is only, that it is like the Law forbids the repetition of such an Ordinance, and therefore I do clear this by other instances.

The first was of Marriage, which hath been ordinarily by the Magistrate and the Minister both in these times. I my self have had a couple come to me, after they were long married, and had a child, and I made no question to marry them again, for the satisfaction of their consciences. The like apprehensions therefore I have perceived in me about this matter. I see indeed some others are ready to question perhaps, whether such who have done thus, have done lawfully; but why not, I pray, as well as contract themselves, and give their mutual consent first, and be married after? Such a consent, *de presenti*, no doubt does *ponere fundamentum relationis*, so that they are Man and Wife *coram Deo* thereby; and what does the solemnity after but declare them so *coram hominibus*, and give them that account

count legally in the world? Now if this testification be not sufficient, but men will account them as unmarried, unless it be by a Minister; nay, suppose the Laws of any place would not allow it otherwise, who would advise but they should do it again? Nay, this is not enough; who would advise that they rather part quite, leave one another, and be no more Man and Wife, rather than be married again? Such is the case and question of ours in hand, for ought I can see, and no less, in this matter of Re-ordination. For the form he objects: I answer, the impropriety of some words in such a case, as to the one, will not argue and infer the same, I hope, altogether in the other; whereof it suffices that I have spoken before already.

A second instance I have, is of the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy: These are taken at our Degrees, at our Orders, and upon particular occasions, as the Law and Magistrate require; and yet did I never hear any plead against this, that it would be taking an Ordinance in vain. Holy *Bradford* the Martyr tells his Judges, that he had taken the same Oath against the Pope six times: Unto this my Opponent says nothing, and indeed nothing can be said. If that only argument of his varied in words be good, that *a man cannot be Ordained twice, because the end of Ordination is attained at once Administration*, then a man may not have either of these Oaths twice administered to him, because the end (to wit, the obliging a man to the contents) is attained at once; and so the Laws and Magistrate that require this on sundry occasions, do require the taking Gods Name in vain. Let my Author come off here if he can. The swearing by Gods Name we know is a solemn Ordinance, & part of Gods Worship; *Deut. 10. 20.* and if this may be repeated upon the forms of Courts, be order of the Laws, & command of our Superiours; let this be satisfaction likewise to us, that what is in vain, as to one end, is not so to another; that what is in vain, in regard of ones self, is not in vain in regard of our obedience, or satisfaction of others.

A third instance is of the Lords Prayer, which we have appointed in the Liturgy to be twice used in one Service. This he dare not condemn simply, for if he did: there is a Text *Matt. 14. 39.* would justify it: But he says, *In the Lords Prayer there are things which every one had need to have renewed, and hence it is we use it often.* Why so is the Grace and Blessing of God with

and upon us for our work, which we pray for in our Orders, that which is continually to be renewed, and consequently, what we may pray for again: and as for our praying to be made *Ministers*, it is but a fond imagination.

For what I allege, that the Scripture speaks of *one Baptism*, I would not have this ingenuous Author think I place any argument in it, only so far as concerns Authority: He knows (I suppose) that Divines ordinarily, Antients and Neotericks, for want of some express Text against iteration of Baptism (though the Unity there be indeed specific, not numerical) do plead those words *One Baptism*, when yet they have not yet so much as this to plead here, *One Ordination*.

For the content of *Chemicus* and Doctor *Balwin*, whom I quote in the cloze of this Section, my Antagonist methinks (p. 77.) is hardly fair, or kind to me in it; not fair, because the Doctor does lay down his arguments to prove a mans former Orders valid, so that he is not to think him *in doubt thereof*, which is his answer; not kind, because when he accounts the Authorities I have for me to be so few (though he considers not, I think, our Divines frequent judgement of *Ananias* imposition of hands upon *Paul* in the way) and should therefore methinks at least remember what *Solomon* bids, *Rob not the poor, because he is poor*, *Pro. 22. 22.* he cannot yet find in his heart to leave me so much as one only; as if, when *charity believeth all things, and envieth not*, he would, with a neglect of Christs Precept towards me, fulfill his words by me: *And from him that hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath.*

SECT. VII.

IN my third Section, I come to Objections. My first is from Scandal, which I have laid down as it most touched me: I shall speak here of this head, which is become so needful, more at large.

Scandal, I humbly conceive, may be divided into that which tends only to displeasure, or that which tends unto sin.

For scandal of displeasure, there are, I will account, two cases.

1. When a man doth that thing, whereby, or wherewith another is *wary* only, or distasteth, so that he hath the less esteem or kindness for him; and perhaps speaks evil of him for it, and that is all. In this case, I suppose, though a man is not willingly to offend any at all, yet as to the main here, he is to walk uprightly with God, and his own Conscience, and not to be much troubled how others do take it (1 Cor. 10. 30.) but rather account this a part of that Lesson that Christ teaches us, to wit; of *self-denial*, and the Light of Nature likewise, *Ne se quisque feris extra*. Nay, though a man should haply hereupon go from my Ministry to another, I should but be apt only to think he might profit better there. It is not this passive, but active Scandal (though I chuse not to use School-terms) which makes us culpable in lawful things. Again, when a thing is scandalous, *per se*, it must be avoided, but when it is so *per accidens* only, the greater accidents must weigh down the less.

2. When a man doth that thing whereby his Brethren are *grieved*, they account it to be amiss, and of ill consequence, and so are piously afflicted at it. In this case, a man (I judge) is to be much more tender and wary, so that if the matter be only of private concernment, he should lose very much rather, and *non nisi parè intolerabili difficultate* (to use the words of *De Valentia*, this Author hath quoted in season) be brought to do it: But if the matter be of publick concernment, to wit, in the commands of the Magistrate, or Church-Order, I cannot think that the grief of a Brother can be equal in the Scales with the offending the Magistrate, and breaking peace, if there be no more indeed in it, than that he is grieved. I am not convinced yet, that any Scandal (as men call it) that tends only to displeasure, whether of anger or grief, is scandalizing my Brother in Scripture sense, upon which there is laid such stress as there is: That one bare word *λογίζομαι* Rom. 14. 15. is fit methinks to be interpreted by the context and scope of the other words that go along with it.

There is, then in the next place, that Scandal which tendeth to sin (*Scandalum altivum*) which is Scandal indeed, in the sense of Gods Word, and the Schools, to wit, such an act in things evil or indifferent, as does *præbere alteri occasionem ruinae*. Of this, I judge, there are mainly three cases in Scripture.

1. When a man doth that, which opens the Mouth of wicked men against the Wayes of God; and causeth them to blaspheme, vent their malice, or the like; In this case the distinction of *Scandalum datum*, and *acceptum*, I think, does properly take place. Let a man take heed here how he gives occasion. This will highly aggravate an evil, Ro. 2. 24. enough to break a *David's* bones; *Wo be to him by whom the offence cometh.* But if the occasion be only *taken*, Jesus Christ hath taught us by his example, toward the Pharisees, (which therefore by Divines is called *Scandalum Pharisaeorum*) what reckoning we are to make hereof; who when he was told, they were offended at him, answered thus, *Let them alone.* And here also may that of *Tertullian* be mentioned, *Scandalum, nihil est, non bona rei, sed mala est exemplum, edificans ad delictum. Bona res neminem scandalizant nisi malam mentem.* De Virg. Vel. Lib.

2. When a man doth that, whereby some that are new Converts or weak Christians, are so unable to bear, that it turns them from their profession. It is probable, that this is that chief matter the Scripture does intend, when it takes such special care against Scandal. Thus happily our Saviour words are to be construed, when he speaks so dreadfully of scandalizing any of his little ones, *Matth. 18.7.* Suppose it by Persecution, or otherwise. Thus perhaps is that great case in the Epistles to be understood, concerning the weak Jews, who were so held by the Law to their Ceremonies, and Meats, that they were ready to leave the Gospel, rather than see them trespass; from whence we may conjecture the sense of such expressions, *For Meat destroy not the Work of God*; Suppose it the work of Conversion, begun in such a person, and *Destroy not him with thy Meat for whom Christ died.* Hooker I remember, a man of a strong mind, sets himself alone in that apprehension. In this case I suppose there is none, but will judge that Charity (so highly concerned) which is the end of Gods Commandments, must over-rule any command of man, so that we must suffer any thing in the Outward man, rather than work the eternal loss of our Brothers Soul. The worst the Magistrate can do, will hardly amount to so much as to have a Millstone tied about the neck, and be thrown into the Sea, but this were certainly more eligible (unless Christ's own words will not go), than the other.

3. When a man acts in indifferent things; whereof he being instructed, or having knowledge, another by his example is induced to do the same, having not that knowledge, and so sins. And this may be either when the thing as to the account upon which he acts is sin indeed, as in the 1 Cor. 8. where the Apostle saies, *Some with Conscience of the Idol, eat it as a thing offered to an Idol*, we may understand it (comparing it with 1 Cor. 10.) that some of these Corinthians being but new-converted, had hankering thoughts yet towards their Idol, as the Jews towards their abolished Rites, so that when they saw any others eating of those Meats in those Temples, upon the account the Idol was nothing, they upon the account of that fear and worship they were formerly wont to give them, did eat after their pattern, and so eating, it was flat Idolatry. Or when the thing is evil only, or sin, because they think it so to be. *To him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean* as in the ordinary case about Dayes and Meats, and those Rites in question, where a Weak Brother (as we may conjecture the case to be) seeing one eat what is lawful for him, because his Conscience is instructed, follows him, and eats too, though it be with a Doubting and resisting Conscience, and so falls into sin. And this is that Scandal Dr. Hammond saies (in his treat of Scandal) the Apostle intends Ro. 14. in the whole context, v. 13. to the end, *So that we may do nothing* (saies he) *though so us never so lawful, which we have reason to fear, that another who thinks it unlawful, may yet without satisfying his Conscience be likely to do after us.* In this case upon my farthest thoughts (that have been apt heretofore to take it up in a huddle, that Scandal of Brethren weighs lights to the command of Authority, as some Doctors speak) I am convinced now at the present of these two things, both that the Magistrate cannot command me to use a thing which will scandalize my Brother in this sense, which the Scripture does so stand upon, as to lay down a negative Chapter about the same; and that if he do, I break not the fifth Commandment, to forbear doing the things, un: I see how I may avoid the Scandal if I do it; The reasons are, 1. Because of the Superiour command; the Scripture saies, do it not, *Lay not a stumbling block in the way, for thy Brother to fall*, and God is to be obeyed before Man. 2. Because the Apostle tells us expressly, that to sin against our weak

Brother, to as to wound his Conscience, is to sin against Christ; 1 Cor. 8. 12. and no Law can command me to sin against the Lord. 3. Because Humane Laws can bind only the Outward man, and not the Conscience, (to wit, *immediate, ratione consequentis, &c.*) and therefore so long as I do it not out of contempt or neglect of him, but in Conscience to Christ, and tenderness to my Brother, I am to conceive it is his pleasure (if a good man) I should forbear till it may be safe, and if not, I must suffer his will, rather than do it.

And here we are cast upon that point, which is so sore and nearly concerning all of us at this season, in regard of our present impressions that are fallen, or falling now upon us. The worthy D. before mentioned, had once given me some ease, in a notion of his, upon 1 Cor. 8. which since I have read this Tract mentioned, I find, serves me not; but how light soever he may make of other Scandal (which is but called so) in comparison of publick Authority; Yet as for Scandal in this sense, which he makes the whole drift of one place (as I have said) there is none can lay more weight upon me in it, than he, so that I must confess my own Conscience not to be tender only, but even as I may say, *raw* in this case.

As for my Adversary, I must embrace him for his kindness and worthiness, who hath not brought here the rough hand of Mars, but of a Physician, where it is need, and offers his relief, and that is from two learned Authors he quotes, 1. *That Scandals are not culpable, where there is not some moral reason in them.* 2. *That when a thing cannot be forborn, sine maxima aliqua difficultate, the Law of Scandal binds not.* This indeed is some Sugar to the wound, but the Salve is behind, where he adds, *He may do well to weigh this, whether he endeavoured first to satisfy his Brethren about him, for many things may be lawfully done, after we have given a reason and laboured to prevent stumbling, which could not else be done without sin.*

These words of his, though they be a rebuke to me, I accept thankfully, and that not only because I am a man, that when I maintain my subject, am yet ready to acknowledge my failings, and crave Gods mercy, but also because I take this item to be that which does afford us the only true and substantial solution, unto this so deeply touchy and sore objection of scandal; and that is, it must be answered by practice; to wit, the argument

ment from Scandal against indifferent things enjoyed, let it be pressed as sharp as it can, does not *destroy the action*, and void the duty, but *insets circumspection*: My meaning is, that it follows not, that therefore the thing may not be done at all, but that there is care and prudence to be used, that the Scandal be avoided in the doing, and the act forborn (and that, only) in the mean season.

In the instance of the Apostle about meats, although he will have a man carefully abstain, when he knows or is told that some are by, who are like to be stumbled at it, yet when he knows it not, or is not told so, he bids him eat with a free spirit, and without making any question; *for the earth is the Lords, and the fulness thereof*: From whence I shall gather, that when a man hath considered the action he is about (suppose it required of his Superiours, and that he is satisfied of the lawfulness of it) and hath taken that care as to satisfy all he can think are like to be stumbled at it, so that his Conscience does sincerely tell him the Coasts are now clear to his appearing, to wit, that there are none he knows likely to be induced to the same (or something else thereby) against their Consciences; that is, led to sin by it (for if it be only that some are like to be displeased, obedience to Governours over-rules that) then may he act freely, and account himself quit from this scruple.

Let me instance in a late needful matter of this season: Suppose a man thought it best for the condition of his people, at the interim, to read the Book of Common-Prayer, and had still the liberty of his Majesties Declaration, let it be for as little while as it will: This scruple only sticks with him; others hearing hereof (thinks he) may follow my example, and if they do what I do without my reasons and grounds, they may go beyond their Conscience, and so sin. Hereupon then he openly declares, that whereas he uses Common-Prayer, and perhaps does gratifie his peoples desires in any of the Offices of it, that yet he still does it only according to the liberty vouchsafed in this Gracious Declaration. Now if any of his Brethren, upon the relation hereof follows him, he shall not sin against his Conscience, because the liberty his Majesties Declaration gives him, is to do it only according to his Conscience. Again; Suppose another hath some of his People, that question farther, not only his reading, but their hearing, they think it sin to joyn with him;

him; if he shall read it then, he tears (and justly) that he shall lay a stumbling block in their way, and so may wound their Consciences. Hereupon, he goes to every one of these parties privately, and satisfies them of the lawfulness of what he does, and perhaps, for their sakes, will omit certain passages which they cannot bear; and if there remains but one or two haply unsatisfied, he wishes them to lay down their Erronious Conscience as soon as they can; but in the mean time, if they cannot, (seeing it does *ligare*, though not *obligare* (as Divines speak) and they must not go against it) to forbear coming in a while till the Psalm; and so is the Scandal obviated, as to them, and he left free as to others, to the general edification.

I am here led by the way to answer one Objection concerning this Common Prayer, because I perceive it does begin to sink upon mens Consciences, and that is this only, that it is (they say) taken out of the Mass: The scruple is thus urged. The Apostle, 1 Cor. 10. 28. determines, that in case our Brother saith unto us, *This hath been offered to an Idol*, we must not eat for his sake that shewed it. Here the case is the like; our Brethren tell us, such and such parts of the Common Prayer have been offered in Idolatrous Service, for they are in the Mass, therefore we may not use it for their sakes that are Scandal'd at it: How the Scandal is to be carefully avoided, I have said, that is, by practice: But for the Argument, I answer, not barely that the Scriptures are in the Mass, because they will say, *Purely Divine Institution is not capable of defilement*: Nor only will I instance in the Creed, a pure Humane Composition; and yet what heart can serve him, to think because that form is used in the Mass, it is so defiled, that it cannot be used in our Church? But directly I must say, that there is here a clear mistake (for God forbid it should be any thing else) It follows not, because such and such prayers and passages are in the Mass, that therefore a Brother may say, *This is offered in an Idolatrous Service*, because while the Mass is saying, only in those prayers, and passages, or Confession of Faith (which are innocent and honest things in themselves, and so acknowledged) It is not an Idolatrous Service. (I say all that while it is not) but such a Service as God requires of us, and them, and all others, which is the invocation and acknowledgement of his Holy

holy Name, according to the Scriptures and his own Commandment. If this Argument were used against the Ceremony of bowing towards the Communion Table, it might happily come close. That Act of Adoration certainly is given by the Papists to the Bread which they believe to be Christ himself, so that a Brother may say here truly, *This is offered to an Idol*. The Apostle then saies, *Do it not for his sake*. One may say, I do it only as the Ancients, *Bowing toward the East*, in token of Christ's Coming; *Not to the Altar*, as the Papists, in token of his Presence there. But this I doubt will not serve, because it is not to the point; The point in earnest lies not upon thy Conscience, but on the Conscience of him that shews it. The strong Christian might say as well, he knew that an *Idol was working*, and had his account to himself, yet must not he sue for Conscience sake; What Conscience? Why, not his own, but the others; v. 29. to wit, that are scandalized at it. Whether this can be answer'd (I confess) I know not; But for Common-Place only, if the strong Christian I account, could have said to his Brother, You are mistaken Sir, you have been told false, this meat was not offered to an Idol, there had been an end between them; So is the answer in this matter.

To return to our particular point of Re-ordination. We may consider, a man may perhaps in the first place avoid the Scandal by doing it in private, that none know of it. If not so, those that are capable to be scandalized in this sense we speak of, are but our fellows in the Ministry, and we are not ordinarily to suppose them as weak Brethren, but to have knowledge; if they have nor, there is a good partition between thy Ordination and theirs; that they may inform themselves, which we may believe of them, and so the fear be the less, that they should be wounded by us; However, I will suppose that a man does consider whether there be any about him like herein to follow his example; As for such as speak against him for it, or give him ill words, he pakes; but as for such as approve it, and are pleased with him, as glad perhaps to be born cut to do the same, these are the men to be feared, and thereupon he goes to them, and imparts his grounds or account upon which he acts (or hath acted) that if they are not satisfied with the same, they may forbear; and if they do follow him, he may have reason to judge that they do it with the like Conscience as to the lawfulness

nels of it, as he hath, and then is the Objection of Scandal prevented, which could not else perhaps be answered; and what the most learned man cannot do with his parts, the prudent may do with his pains, and the humble heart go beyond the best head in the world.

And here for the discharge of my own Soul, in reference to such who may be induced by me unto this thing, I must humbly lay two charges upon them; The first is, that they do thoroughly ponder the Book of Orders, and every thing besides, that will be required of them, before-hand, and if they be not perswaded in their minds that it is lawful for them, let them not do it. (I charge them) for the word; I will not be guilty of wounding their Souls, but tell them, if they do it and doubt, if they act not in faith, it is sin unto them, that is sure. The second then is, if they be satisfied themselves, that yet, if they do but imagine any of their Brethren like to follow them, with a Conscience unsatisfied, they take special care to prevent it, which else doth put in a barr to them, whereas if they go to them, and satisfy them with their reasons, or else warn them to forbear, so that they understand from them that they are not like to do it for their example till satisfied, the passage is open; And let them then be sure they have a sincere heart in the main, I humbly hope as they act in faith, so they may wish comfort and success. *And the Priest said unto them, go in peace; before the Lord is your way wherein you go.*

SECTION VIII.

IN my fourth Section, I come to a second Objection. 'Ordination is that which, according to Divines, does give the Ministerial Office; This is the end, they account thereof; Now when a man is, a Minister already, there is not this end, and consequently the Ordinance taken in vain. Thus have I laid it down, and my Answer to it is this, 'There is more ends than one in Ordination, as in Baptism, and other Institutions. It is not necessary to the using an Ordinance, that a man be capable of all its ends, but of some right end of the same. We have had the Objection in hand before, as the main Argument of this
Authors

Authors-Book, and there you have therefore my full and complete Answer to it. That which I have to do here, is only the maintaining this present Solution. Unto which then, thus he replies, *We grant this; but then a man must take it in such a form of words, as is expressive only of that end whereof he is capable. As in Aged Marriage, the Prayer for Issue must not be used.* But let this Gentleman hold a little, for he goes on upon a supposal, that in our Orders there are Prayers put up for us, to be made Ministers. (to use his own words, p. 68.) which if it were true, it would indeed be just alike with us here, as to pray for the blessing of Children, upon a couple that are past it. But he may soon know the Church hath no such odd Prayer, inconsistent with the reason of the form it self. He adds, *One that is ordained already, and so a Minister, may be ordained again in order to the free exercise of his Ministry, but not ordained with that Ordination, whose chief end is to give the Ministerial Commission and Authority.* Unto this, as his whole strength, I have spoken at first in my two Generals, about the form, and supposition of the nature of Orders. That I have now to take notice of, and cannot pass, without injury both to ingenuity and my self, is the Candour and Integrity of my Adversary. He is pleased to grant me here the Question I dispute for: My Question is, *Whether and how a Minister ordained, by the Presbiterie, may take Ordination also by the Bishop?* And I determine it, though he cannot be ordained again to his Ministry, he may as to the free use of it in the English Church. Now my Adversary does directly yield this; I desire all my Brethren to see and own it. Nevertheless in the question included, *how* this may be done, he is a little more stiff than I am. He supposes the form that is used, is improper to our case; I have therefore proposed my Desire (p. 92. in my sheets) for another; Thus we agree still, but then we part here; if this cannot be had, he thinks the substance unlawful for the shadows sake, and I am apt to think that for the substance sake, being lawful, the shadow may be born, if indeed it cannot be help'd. I proceed, 'The common and general end of Baptism, was for remission of sins, yet was Jesus Christ baptized, who was not capable of that end. He answers; Let Mr. H. if he can prove that in the Baptism of Christ, any words were used by John, expressive of such an end, as Christ was not ca-

publicst. But what a poor come off is this, when he thus spoken so like a Scholar, and judicious man besides? That Christ was baptized, we know; That Baptism was for remission of sins, whereof Christ was incapable, we know likewise, and consequently, that an Ordinance may be used by a man who is not capable of its grand end, but some other, is proved. But with what form of words (whether any or none) John baptized Jesus with, neither I nor he do know. I argue then from what I know; This Author answers in what he does not know, and that is, very near, he knows not what to answer.

And here I find next, he hath made a great slip; for when I have said, there are more ends than one in Orders, I open my self. *Ordination gives a man his Commission (according to others) and installs him in it; it makes a man a Minister, and also signifies him to be such before men; it gives the Office, and also makes him received at such in the Church where he is sent.* It is true, a man who is ordained already, is not capable of the one end, but he is of the other. He that was a Minister before, cannot be made so now, as to have the Office given him, but he may have the same Office declared or signified, I hope, more than once (as in the Inauguration of Princes) when there is need for the better execution thereof; and acceptance with the people. This my Opponent should not have passed, as also that I am wary till of the first of these ends, so say I do suppose it only, and not grant it. It may suffice, that I have in my first work maintained my question, notwithstanding that supposition, without which, many of my Brethren perhaps would scarce have received it into their thoughts to digest it. But now the light I will conceive, may have broken in at least something upon their minds through the crannies I have there, I may follow the same here more openly, and if this Supposition also be laid aside, there is no remora left in the business.

But to follow him where he please, he produces after this my chief Instance, which is such (I must confess) that I dare alone venture all my whole Cause upon it. Paul is made a Minister by Christ himself, *Act. 16. 16, 17, 18.* yet was he Ordained after by the hands of men, *Act. 13.* These words of mine he quotes, where I shall take in by the way a passage from *Chrysostom* upon the same. *Paulus licet immediate vocatus tamen ad*

*Impositionem manuum, quod imponit manus in Ecclesia constat de voca-
tione, Act. 9. 17. Et Act. 13. 3. cum inter gentes ablegandus erat,
virsus impositione manuum ordinarius Gentium Doctor constituitur,
& hie rursus ideo fuit adhibitus ut publica ejus vocatio declararetur lo-
quissima, nec alii consimiliter de eo gloriarentur. Loc. Com. De Ec.
This great Divine we see is exprels for Re-ordination. For my
part I see not how any can deny but *Ananias* laid his hands on
Paul for the confirmation of his Ministry, as well as for the re-
ceiving of his sight; yet dare not I place any of my strength
there, but build on what is sure. *Paul* is made a *Minister*, that
is certain, by Christ himself. *I have appeared to thee for this pur-
pose, to make thee a Minister,---and now I send thee, &c.* So
1 Tim. .12. *I thank Jesus Christ---putting me in the Ministry.*
Again, *Gal. 1.* He stands upon it expressly, that he had not his
Ministry of men, nor by men, but by Jesus Christ. From whence
then it appears, that a man may be a Minister already, and yet
be Ordained; or what is all one, a man may be Ordained, and
not to this end of his receiving his Office or Ministerial Au-
thority thereby, and yet the Ordinance not be taken in vain.
Here then is my answer made good, the proof full, and must
stand against the world. Let us see what my Adversary sayes to
it. Here is something (sayes he) supposed which cannot be proved, sa-
thet that *Paul* was before a Minister, when some learned men say he
was but only a Probationer and Candidate to the Office, or that *Paul*
was now in the 13. Act. made a Minister, when others do say, that
laying on of hands, there, was rather Optative than Ordinate. As
for which, I must needs wonder more than once, that a judici-
ous man should be so sleight here, where indeed my strength
lies. I wonder first, how he does account, that what I have
said, can possib'e suppose the last of these; to wit, that *Paul* was
made a Minister here, when that which I say and prove is the
direct contrary, that he was a Minister before. And I wonder
again, what proof this Gentleman would ha'e more, that *Paul*
was a Minister before, than to have Christs own mouth li-
terally to say it, and *Paul* also to be his Witness? What face can
any learned man put upon this? Was Christs immediate Mis-
sion Authoritative to all the rest of the Apostles, and *Paul* be
only a Probationer until his Orders? If this be their learning,
I had rather hear reason. *Vulgus aliquando plus sapit* (sayes La-
tians) *quia tantum quantum satis est sapit.* The truth is, this*

worthy Author and I do fully agree, that this Ordination of Paul and Barnabas was not to their Office (*non eo spectabat ut Episcopatum gratiam eis largiretur*, sayes Mason) but to Epov, as it is express; and consequently, besides the setting a man apart to his Office, there may be another Ordination, if it be to the same ends as theirs was in this place: *whereas therefore we are bid* (he goes on) *to tell the Bishop, if he should ask wherefore wilt thou be Ordained, that we come to be Ordained to that end, that very end S. Paul was here Ordained to; I say this is very good wholesome counsel and advise.* Loe here then we are again agreed, and it remains only to enquire, what were those ends these Apostles here were ordained to, and if we are capable of the same, we may be re-ordained. As for what he annexes hereunto, it is either answered already in the form, or belongs to the next Section.

There are therefore two ends, I humbly suppose, of this Ordination of these Apostles, the one appears in the Text, the other arises from the nature of the Ordinance it self.

For the first, this is most manifest, that the Holy Ghost calls forth these persons to a special work of the Ministry, and so the words; *Separate to me* ver. 2. are interpreted: Ver. 4. *So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost.* Now those Elders that were there, do hereupon joyn in imposition of hands and prayer, and that action is described by the holy Penman of the Acts himself, Act. 14. 26. to be *a recommending them to the Grace of God for their work.* From whence I gather, that if any of my tender and worthy Brethren be out of their places, and have a Call to a new, or intend to apply themselves therunto as they ought, there is the same reason for a fresh imposition of hands upon them with prayer, as there was here for Paul and Barnabas, to wit, to commit them to the Grace of God for that particular charge. There is one thing only may be apt likely to come into their thoughts against this; to wit, that this looks at first sight like Independantism; But I beseech them let not that stumble ary; It is the End we say in Morals, that specifies the Action, and so long as this be done on an Episcopal or Presbyterian account, it can be no Independent opinion. There is none I hope will say, my Creed is the Independent Creed, and think, that therefore I should leave it. There are two things therefore I will offer here, to remove this scruple from

from my Brethren, being needful, to wit, a *President*, and also *Satisfaction*.

For the Precedent I find one, which is most apposite in the Archbishop of St. *Andrews His. Scot.* p. 431. One Mr. *Roberts* having Preached ordinarily in *Edinburgh*, ten years upon the approbation of the general Assembly, maintaining it to be equivalent to any Ordination, upon ten dayes debate, they came to agree, that the Commissioners did acknowledge *his calling to be a Pastor in Edinburgh lawful*, and yet that he should be Ordained. Here I note, that a man who is acknowledged a Minister already, may be Ordained by the judgement of Presbyterians, even of the *Scots* themselves; And that the account I offer is not Independent; the story goes on, and tells us further, this was the form they agreed upon, that *the Imposition of hands was not used as a Ceremony of his Ordination to the Ministry, but of his Ordination to a particular Flock*. This was acted Anno 1598.

For satisfaction upon this, whereas we have the distinction here between a general and particular Ordination; I desire this particular Ordination be understood, not to the *Office*, but to the *Work*. It is the Independent tenent, I take it, that all power Christ hath given to the *Church*, is to be applyed to the diffusive body, and so they account it is the people by their choice do constitute their own Pastor in that individual relation; Consequently, when that particular gathered company dissolves, that man ceases to be a Pastor, and while it lasts, upon the same consequence, he cannot ever separate from it. *Regula mutua se ponunt & tollunt*. For my part, who am apt to believe that Christ hath given Pastors and Teachers to his Church, only as Catholick, *Eph. 4.* I know not whether it be warrantable to be Ordained a particular Pastor in this sense; supposing, as most do, that Election or Orders gives the Office; Methinks however, I should not choose to be so made, for the reason mentioned, as also because there is reason in the mouth of those men of *Dan*, *Is it not better to be a Priest to a Tribe in Israel, than to the House of one man?* This I take it to be Independentism. But when a man is already a Minister of the Catholick Church, to have a particular laying on of hands only, unto the work unto which he is called in a severall place, I am assured in my belief, that we are most fully warranted by this on-

by instance of these Apostolical persons, who were no Independents I think, at least in this point in hand, being certainly Catholick Ministers, and yet Ordained to that particular work (not to the Pastorship) of some Churches whereunto they were at present called. And here I cannot but observe farther the gracious providence of God, which for the time hitherto, as it were determined our case. Our present Ecclesiastical Rulers would not see a man have Institution without Episcopal Orders; and there hath been an *Act of Confirmation* of all Ministers already, in any living, though ordained only by Presbyters. Now then if any of my tender Brethren, scrupled this business, as being without precedent, if they were already in a living God; provided against their scruple and confirmed them. If they are out of a living, then God hath provided for them in his Word, this instance undeniable of *Paul*, that a man who is a Minister already, may be Ordained for all that, unto the particular work of that new place, whereunto he shall be called. And why may not this be strengthened from the *Priest* under the Law, who though he was dedicate to God and his Office at once, did consecrate himself often to some particular service upon emergent occasions? There is nothing more can be objected against it, but the Form, which is already answered.

The other end of their using this Rite here, I will conceive to be that which I have mentioned from that great Divine before named, *Et hic ritus ideo fuit additus ut publica ejus vocatio, declararetur legitima.* St. *Paul* was called immediately to the Gospel, at first by Christ, and here by the Holy Ghost to this work: Others might not know this, or believe it. This addition of these eminent *Prophets and Teachers* at *Antioch*, is as it were the publick testimony of the Church thereof. There was none could question the other Apostles Authority, who was known to have been with Christ in his life, but as for *Paul*, unto whom he appeared miraculously afterwards, though he had the same Authority (and by him alone) then given, yet as the Disciples of the Jews durst not trust this, until they were confirmed by *Ananias*, so was it convenient no doubt also for the Gentiles, that this Divine Call of his should be approved and attested by this Ordination, which must from hence therefore be irrefragably defined (as I have said) the *Confirmation*

ordination only of our Vocation. Two sorts there are now of my Brethren in distress about being re-ordained, some that have a call to a new place, and some that cannot else keep their old; Though the former of these (I confess) have their way here most plain, yet may the rest (I think) be kept from stumbling also; who though they cannot take a fresh Imposition of hands so clear to the first end as the former, for the committing them to Gods blessing upon their new charge; yet may they submit here to the latter end, for Confirmation of their Ministry, as well as any.

It is a serious question I propose, therefore in my Book, when we see in this place for certain (by this instance of Paul and Barnabas) that *the reason* of Ordination is not for to give the Ministerial Function, and the *χ&εραυα* in Timothy is something else; *What is the reason of it then?* 'Why really (I say) I think it is this; This solemn Rite does give an outward Authority before the Church, that is, the current repute or valuation to a man of a Minister: So that he who was truly called of God before, is now received as such, by all, as to the exercise of his Function, with freedom and acceptance. I cannot express my self more fully, nor argue more firmly than I do upon it. The Reason of a precept is to be look'd on as the Precept: but the reason why we should be ordained at all, does now arise upon us to be re-ordained (to wit, because else we cannot have this reception, or enjoy this End of Ordination, thus express, in our Church) and consequently so far as we have Precept, or Scripture example to warrant or command the one, it is, and must be of force for the other. And here, there is but one thing since, I must profess, hath ever been upon my mind to give any check unto this, and that is, if the End I speak of could be proved in Scripture, then there were nothing indeed more satisfying; but the Scripture does not express this End of Orders; and if we know not that God hath appointed this for an End thereof, then will it not be a safe ground for our acting upon it. I answer. There are two means whereby we may know a thing to be of Divine warrant, or conformable to Gods Will, the Scripture, and Right Reason: *That which is evident by, and consonant to the true light of Nature, or natural Reason, is to be accounted pure Divino in matters of Religion,* sayes the Authors of *Jus Divin.*

Reg. Es. c. 3. Now though it be the first end mentioned, only, that I dare say is *express* in the Word, yet must I needs affirm, that this other I stand upon, is so evident in the nature it self of the Solemnity, and consonant to the dictates of Reason, that I am perswaded there is none of my Brethren that shall receive it in the clearness of it, but will be satisfied in their Consciences that they follow no other than the mind of God in it : Nevertheless I shall not be wanting (through his grace) to strengthen their assurance herein, with an instance or two from Scripture it self, to put it (if possible) even beyond dubitation ; The one is in *Acts* 1. where we have a kind of Divine Ordination of *Matthias* into the Apostleship by lots : It is said *v. ult.* *They gave forth their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbred with the eleven Apostles.* Here it is apparent, that the immediate effect of this external signification of Gods Will by lot, whereby *Matthias* is constituted one of the Apostles, is this same *value, repute, account, as an Apostle* (or as a Minister, which I stand upon) He was *numbred*, that is, with the most Learned, only reputed, reckoned, acknowledged amongst the Apostles. The other instance is in *Num.* 27. where we have a Civil Ordination (if I may so say) of *Joshua* to the Government, as of us to the Ministry : Now the Lord there, *v. 18.* commands *Moses* to take him, and set him before the Congregation, and lay his hands upon him. Here is this same Symbolical Rite (from whence it is supposed by some to be taken up in the New Testament ;) And wherefore must he do this ? I pray read on *v. 20.* *And thou shalt put some of thine honour upon him, that all the Congregation of the Children of Israel may be obedient.* Loe here the very genuine natural reason of such Solemnities : The meaning is. I take it, as much as to say, Commend him in publick as appointed of God (*Hoc ritu denotat eum* (saies one) *legitimè a deo electum esse*) and meet for the Office, that he may thereby have a *value, repute, honour, or authority* before the people, as may qualifie him (like thy Successor) for the execution of his charge, and acceptance with them ; I will close it up with *(benignus Application, Impones Jozua manus & dabis ei partem glorie tue, hoc est, auctoritatem, quâ tu hactenus ornatus fuisti, dabis successor tuo : Ita quoque publice auctoritas coram ecclesia, tribuitur ei, cui manus sunt impostæ.*

I must add, lest this be mistaken, There is (I count) the *jus* and faculty, *coram deo*, and this Authority, *coram ecclesia*. It is the last flowes from Orders, the other only from Christ.

And here there be some (I suppose) of my Episcopal Fathers may act upon such an account as this: The Presbyterians have thought it good in their Orders to have no such Form of Words as are actually conferring of power (the true reason, by the way, though they have not all known one anothers minds, being indeed, lest we should think the spiritual power it self to be conferred hereby, which is but the outward investiture only) and hereupon they are apt to think such no Ministers, or without power, and so ordain them again. But though I take this to be the very best plea that such who go so high can have, yet must I needs judge it a conception both injurious and fond, to believe, that a man who is set apart to the Office of a Minister by all other solemnity that is needful, shall yet have no Authority given him by God, for that Office only, for the defect of a Formality. That there are not such words used as are in the Episcopal Orders, is a conceit never like to lodge with me. Such men as these (I judge) have not yet learned what Mr. Hooker hath taught them, that *neither Spirit, nor spiritual Authority proceeds from man*; Or what others have added more perspicuously, that it is derived to us, as that of elected Magistrates in Cities, immediately from *our Charter*, which they have from the King, and we from Christ Jesus. But now Sirs, if you will distinguish here betwixt our Authority Spiritual, and *our Authority only before men*, and account that those words, *Take thou Authority*, are necessary, if you will, for the giving only the latter, that is, that unless our Orders be these which are according to our Church, they will not suffice now to the putting that *estimation* upon us, as Ministers, that we may have the free use of our Ministry thereby, and thereupon re-ordination only be urged, and used, I must sit down here, and drive the nail along with you.

There is one thing only remains to be vindicated in this Section, and that is, that other instance I have produced for me on this subject, to wit, of the Apostles themselves, who are sent out by Christ with Authority to preach the Gospel, *Mat. 10. 7.* in his life, and yet after he is risen, he renews their

their Authority, Jo. 20. 21. *As my Father sent me, so send I you.* There is a second mission, and yet is not this all, for if we mark the Text, we find that this was the same day at evening (v. 19.) when he rose, while his Disciples are in a house at Jerusalem, and Thomas expressly not with them, v. 24. There must be another time therefore, wherein this Commission is again delivered, unless Thomas had not the same Power or Commission with the rest, and that we have expressly on a Mountain in Galilee, where Christ had appointed them to meet him, Mat. 28. 16. And there is their grand Commission finally repeated and established. *Go, Preach and Baptize, I am with you to the end of the world.* Now let the question (say I in my sheets,) be put then, to the highest, whether an Authority or Commission to an Office or Work, may be renewed? (even supposing Others did give the Ministerial Authority) and it is here exemplified and proved in the most signal President we can have in the earth. Who can think that to be unlawful, which Christ did to his Apostles himself? But I will not let this go thus. I have before somewhere distinguish'd from Hooker, between the spiritual power or commission it self, and the delivery of it. I will choose to say here (if I may) that the Commission it self and Authority Christ gave the twelve to be his Apostles, might be but one and the same, and given at first (which besides that we cannot but think Christ gave them the Office when he gave them the Name of the Office, Thomas absence mentioned at the time the power of binding and loosing was particularly given, may be perhaps a *medium* to prove) yet the delivery of it by way of charge, was often, as he saw it good, for the fuller enforcement thereof, or establishment of them in the same. And this is no new Doctrine, but as a person worthy of all credit in a matter of this nature, as being most thoroughly read in the Fathers does tell us, that the powers *Matth. 16. 19. Jo. 20. 23. Mat 18. 18.* are taken to be one and the same powers by the Doctors of the Primitive Church, which they do unanimously acknowledge to be given unto the Apostles, both in right and possession (as to the essential parts of the powers) before Christ's death. Chrysost. de sacerdotio. 3. Ambros. l. 1. de pñit. c. 1. & 6. Hier. ad Heliod. de vita solis. Arhanas. Serm. in illud [*perfecti in pagum*]. Cyr. de simplicit. Prælat.

The learned Author proceeds, and having considered and compared their sayings with themselves and the Scriptures, gives us two assertions; First, *They do not deny* (saies he) *the said powers to have been given (as to their essentials) unto the Apostles, when he called them to the Apostleship, and gave them the name of Apostles.* Secondly, *They agree, that all the Apostles received those powers, when our Saviour breathed on them, and that this was a solemn Ordination of them, giving them more grace to accompany their Ministry, than they had in their first call, and less solemn Ordination.* Chrysost. in Joh. hom. 8cc. Cyp. de simp. Præl. August. De Civit. dei. 64. & Quæst. ex vet. & nov. Test. c. 93.

He yet adds, *This is the more proper Ordination of the Ministers of the New Testament, the full original, and seminal tradition of the Ministerial Powers, whereby all future Ordinations of the like kind are sanctified; and for these causes our Saviour iterated their Ordination to the Pastoral extraordinary and ordinary Offices, and the rather, lest his death might be thought to have made void their first more secret and covert Ordination.* Mr. Lloid of Primitive Episcopacy and Ceremonies.

I must confess I am not taken with the attributing that to the Text in *John*, which is excellently proper to the last of *Matthew*, *Mat. 20. 18, 19, 20.* Seeing the mission we find in the one, (*Jo. 20. 21.* with the 19. and 24.) appears not to me (by what hath been before touched) to be indeed numerically the same, as to time, place, and persons with the other. Nevertheless, we are beholding to this man enough, that upon search he hath found, that the re-ordaining the Apostles, is not strange to the Ancients, when Reordination yet in *this* is apt to be so, both to them, as him also.

Let us see now what our Author answers to this, which I must needs say beforehand, may very much satisfy us herein, because indeed he falls so short of saying any thing to weaken our belief of it. There be *some* judge (saies he) *the Apostles Commission, Mat. 10. was temporary, and did expire at their return.* But, besides that this is a rare conceit in Divinity, as if the Ministry were a Cloak to be put on, and off again upon occasion; and that it is nothing however to their second mission, *Jo. 20. 21.* when we find they have yet after, a third, *Mat. 28.* It appears expressly that the Disciples Baptized, *Jo. 4. 2.* and wrought

wrought Miracles, *Mat. 17. 16.* when they abode with Jesus. The words of that Text then *Mat. 3. 14.* are here worthy of consideration, *And he appointed twelve (ἐπορεύσας) that they might be with him, and that he might send them to preach.* Here it seems there was some work belonging to the Office of their Apostleship, which they were to perform while they were with him, as well as when they were abroad. This is plain, that when he sent them to Preach, he gave them power to heal the Sick, and do Miracles; and seeing this power did certainly continue with them after they were returned to him, how shall we think any other power which was given with it, and much less (I hope) the whole Office it self, could cease? And therefore this Opponent himself dare put no trust in this, but frames another Answer, that their first Commission was but partial, not to all acts, as to administer the Sacraments, absolve Penitents and the like, Unto which, I shall not need to tell what some say, that when Christ said *do this* he gave his Disciples power to administer the Sacrament, &c. when he said *whose sins ye remit*, &c. *Jo. 20.* he gave them power of Absolution; and yet after both, we read of that chief Commission he finally leaves with them, *Mat. 28. 19.* Nor shall I stick in the sound words of a grave Author, *They received with the Name of Apostles, the power to Minister all the Doctrine and means to Salvation, which Christ intended in due time to deliver, unto them Acts 1. 24. 25. Act. 26. 16.* And therefore when the Sacrament of the Eucharist was instituted, they needed not a new Cyriation, but only a signification of Christ's pleasure, that they should use the power before given them, in the administration of this Ordinance, which is but an extension of the power to a new object. But I reply, that which is most clear and obvious, and what his Answer does not touch (I am sure) in the least; whether the instance it self urged does, the root of the Scruple, or not, he may differ in his apprehension with me, if he will. The Lord Christ had given them Commission for the Preaching of the Gospel and Baptizing, that is certain before; and yet does he renew here the same Authority again to them, *Go Preach and Baptize, Mat. 28.* What is it now for this Opposer to say here, that their Commission granted at first, was partial, such as did not authorize them to all Ministerial acts, as to administer the Sacrament, confirm the Baptized, which were not then in being; when the Commission they

they have *last*, (or is again delivered to them) is this; *Go preach and baptize*; That is, *Such as does authorize them to that part of the Office, or those Ministerial acts they were authorized to before*: Is not here an Authority, or Commission to the same Ministerial Acts, or Work, renewed, or refreshed? That is the point in hand. This Gentleman then, forought I see, might rather have borrowed an answer from me here, that the Apostles were sent out at first only to the Jews, and after to all Nations, and therefore they had a new Commission: To which I reply; 1. The Lord Jesus, if he pleased, might at least (if any will say he did not) have given them their Commission so large at once as to reach Jew and Gentile, and appointed the execution thereof to each according to the due season; And if then he chose to do it at twice, we may conceive even from thence, that the renewal of a Commission hath not therefore any such appearance fore of evil in it as is fancied by my Opposer. 2. Though Christ did say to his Disciples, *Go not in the way of the Gentiles*, at his first sending of them, he did not say, *Go not in the way of the Jews*, at his *last*, but while he says, *Go teach all Nations*, the Jewish Nation is one, and the Chief of those Nations: And while *Peter* was the Apostle of the Circumcision, and *James* and others, did abide among the Jews, the Commission was the same in effect as to them; So that here is an Authority to the same persons, work, and place repeated yet however, Did *Peter*, and *James*, and *John*, that preached to the Jews, preach by virtue of their last Commission, or not? If they did not, their last was in vain, if they did, then was their first and last to the same effect, which is the point wonn. 3. Though the renewal of the Apostles first Commission was by way of enlargement, being confined to the execution at least before to the Jews only, yet when *Pauls* Commission from Christ at first was extended to the Gentiles at large, the Holy Ghost Commissions him again with confinement as to such and such particular Countries. Now then, if a new Commission may be given to the same work, either when it is narrower or larger, the Wit of man may have something to object, but the Conscience may I hope have enough to be satisfied, as to the main; though the work be but of equal extent as it was; For in the Enlargement there is the same, though with more; in the Confinement,

ment, though less, there is only the same. 4. Let this be so, yet here is in general nevertheless a double Commission to the same work exemplified, for they have Commission to preach to the Jews, and then Commission to preach to all Nations; So that Re-ordination hereby is proved, though not our Re-ordination. You may say there is not the same reason for us as for them, but this we gain hence however, that there may be some reason why a Commission may be repeated, and if there may be one, we are put in heart there may be another, and we are sure it is not unlawful altogether. 5. When we see that a Commission may be renewed upon the change of the *Persons* to whom a man is *sent*, why not upon the change of the *Court* which *sends*? So is the Case here; Ordination is the commissioning a man only in the Churches Court; Now the Court of the Church is changed, and that Commission will not pass upon the change that would before, and therefore is renewed. 6. I have made this more statedly serve our case (p. 44.) in my first Sheets, I will conclude therefore the matter: If the Lord himself, whose sending his Disciples as the head of his Church, could not be without the furnishing of them both with abilities and power, does iterate their Commission (at least as to the *delivery*) more than once; What should we stand upon Mans Ceremony? which is, we are sure, but a formal delivery, or investitive only at first, when the Right and Faculty is never from him at all, as *Grotius* speaks; And as *Dr. Ames* in his Cases, *Ordinatio est nihil aliud quam sollemnis declaratio ut coronatio regis & inauguratio magistratus*; And so it comes to no more, to be iterated upon need or good Cause, than for me to repeat, *And they made Solomon King the second time*, that is, what hath been once already signified before. *And Jesus said again unto him yet the third time, Simon Son of Jonas lovest thou me? Feed my Sheep.*

SECTION IX.

IN the Fifth Section, there is a Third Objection; To be re-ordained does seem virtually in the Act to renounce, make void, or offer injury to our first Orders, and that does look like some great

great evil. Unto which, that I may speak hete something more fully, I will acknowledge, so far as I can judge, that this conceit hath gotten into mens minds far and wide from the Ancients, which makes some (the Papists especially) think so haibously of Re-ordination, as if there were no less than Sacrilege in it: Indeed this Author, and our Brethren, at this season, have got a conceit that it is injurious to the Third Commandement, which requires the reverend use of Gods Ordinances, which may be done I hope, when an Ordinance is repeated, as when it is used but once; But if they could then shew me in the scattered Sentences of the Fathers, that this were their harmonious reason why they are against it, it would do more with me for conviction, than any thing else I yet know, because it would make me suspect then some Moral evil perhaps to be in it, when all I apprehend yet is Notional only (as I said at first) or but in mens imaginations.

The rise then, or spring of this conceit, I guess to flow from St. Cyprians time, when Re-baptization was in the World: That pious Bishop and Martyr does plead thus (till in his Writings, There is one Church, one Faith, one Baptism; those that are out of the Church have not the true Faith, and so no Baptism; And therefore they that are baptized of Hereticks must be re-baptized. *Pro certo tenentes neminem foras baptizari extra ecclesiam posse, cum sit baptisma unum intra sanctam ecclesiam constitutum, Lib. 1. Ep. 12.* Hereupon there was none (we must conceive) rebaptized, but they supposed their former Baptism to be void, this being the pleaded ground for their Re-baptization. And though those Disciples *Act. 19th.* who doubted not of the validity of the Baptism they had, did not void Johns Baptism (I hope) in the least, for their being baptized again into the Name of Jesus; Yet while the Party himself here, and the Church were both perswaded otherwise of theirs, this act might be accounted *coram ecclesia*, a kind of professed voidance thereof, and their heresie with it; And consequently when they came to think that Re-baptization did make null their first Baptism, the same thoughts from thence we may conjecture came to possess them about Orders. But as the Fathers which succeeded Cyprian, and Councils, did lay aside his Rebaptization, con-

cluding the ground he went upon erronious, and consequently that the former Baptism of such as were re-baptized (howsoever they thought that re-baptized them) was good and valid according to the Word of God: So do I believe, that after Ages will disprove the ground upon which Re-ordination is now by some required, and our former Orders being valid or good before God, or according to his Word, it is not our being re-ordained can make them null or void, but only they are so in the judgement of such as lye under that conception.

To look then more thoroughly (if we can) into this business, Suppose a man a Minister already, and in Orders, does Re-ordination now make him no Minister, or to have been none, or evacuate his former Ministerial Acts the time before? If that be true, then should I never plead for Re-ordination sure, then must I be ready to think it Sacrilege as soon as any; but this certainly can never be. The Papists do hold that there is an indelible Character imprinted in Orders (*unde iterari non posse*) and anathematize those that gainsay it. To save their curse, I deny not, with our *Hooker*, and *Mason*, if by their Character they mean only *spiritualis potestas* (as some of them do) that there is such a thing, (and they *quoad homines* we may say impressed hereby) which our Divines also do hold indelible; So that the Office being once received cannot be taken away, even by degradation it self, though the *Work* may sometime be made to cease. Now if it were Orders did indeed give this power, as my Opposer, with the most, do think, then must those Orders we take first, stand good and valid against any other we take after (if there were twenty) which can neither make nor marr, as to that end, which is already attained thereby. And here in the way may be one plain Conviction on this Gentleman, that when he does plead, that I make null my first Ordination. and therefore my Profession will not prevail against my Fact, he quite intertars with himself, who still pleads all the way besides, that my first Orders having given me my Ministry already, it is that renders my second in vain.

There are two Books (let me therefore here mention it) come out against Re-ordination, one before, and this Author; two Arguments it is they harp upon; The former stands mainly

mainly upon this, That a second Ordination does in the fact make null the first ; The other insists upon this, That our first Ordination (if he be understood as he must) does null the second, to wit, by rendering it in vain. Now let us set these two Arguments together by the ears, and they must needs fall by the hands of one another ; for if a mans first Ordination be indeed made null, then is not his second in vain ; and if his second be in vain, then is not his first null. The truth is, were the supposition true which they go both upon, it is the last Argument were of force, and the former must be nothing.

Neither would it hence follow, because the Character (if one will call the Power or Office so) is not repeated, therefore the Rite (which does solemnize it) may not, any more, than because the Regal Office, is but one and the same (which must be still urged) therefore the anointing or investiture can be but once also. If a man who is Consecrated, shall desert his first Ordination, and steal away himself from the Ministry into the Laity, when he believes God originally called him, and his labours like still to be serviceable to him, not disabled, nor put to it, by distress, or force, for the safety of his Conscience, Sou's peace, Gods greater glory ; and any will call that Sacrilege ; there may be I think some appositeness indeed in the term ; but if the Papist will call Reordination barely so, and make that the reason why a man may not be Re-ordained, which he renders for the very account upon which he yields hereunto, to wit, because he thinks his Power or Office indeed indelible, and that being entered in the Ministry, he may not go back, and to is contrained to it ; it is but giving an innocent thing ill words, and as it seems to me rather in our case, it is plain in the whole, *A cujus contrarium verum est.*

I cannot therefore but take up a few words here (if it be only to see the Genius at least) of that other Opposer of Reordination. Does not he really renounce his Ordination, recede from his Office, and divest himself of Authority, who taketh up his Ministry, and anew passeth under this constituting investing Ordinance ? M. C. p. 33. which is the chief battering Ramm of that Book. But God forbid this indeed should be so, when Christs Disciples had their Commission, *Go Preach and Baptize,* renewed to them, as hath been said before ; was that second act indeed an actual and formal voidance of the first ? When the

Holy Ghost does separate to him *Paul* for the work wherein to he calls him, *Act. 13*. Does that mission, or sending forth of the *Holy Ghost*, make null his first Ministry, and authoritative mission, by *Jesus Christ*? *Act. 26. 16. --- 18*. When a Jew was baptized in *Christ's* time, did that null his Circumcision? When those Disciples *Act. 19*. were re-baptized, was that Baptism indeed a voiding of their first? Or, *Christ's* Baptism really a renunciation of *John's*? How can any prove that? Was the Ordination of *Barnabas* by those at *Antioch* a divesting him of any authority he had by being sent forth before, by the Church of *Jerusalem*? This cannot be. Yet again, when the men of *Judah* came and annointed *David* King in *Hebron*, was the passing of *David* under this constituting investing Ceremony (to speak with him) really a renouncing his former anointing by *Samuel*, and receding from that Kingly Power and Office which was given him at first by that mouth, which said, *Arise, annoint him, for this is he*? And the Spirit of the Lord came upon *David* from that day forward. Was *Charles* the Seventh of *France* his Coronation at *Rheims*, after he was Crowned at *Poitiers* before, and King by birth, any thing else but a farther establishment of his title, only for the satisfaction and better obedience of his people? It is but so indeed here; And for that the Dream was doubled unto *Pharaoh* twice, it is because the thing is established by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass.

The bottom then of my Adversaries mistake, I have already opened, and cannot omit one note more from *Mr. Baxter*, of whom I have made herein so necessary use before, who gathering an Argument, as solidly as learnedly, from the Magistrate to the Minister, in this case, does tell us, that our Divines in abundance have proved the power of Princes (howsoever men may have an hand in their Election and Investiture) to be immediately from God (for which he mentions particularly *Spalatensis*, *Saravia*, and *Bilson*, that any who will may inform themselves) whereupon he hath these words, p. 146. And for my part, I think I shall never consent to any that will give more to men in making a Minister, than in making a King. All power is of God; the Powers that be, are ordained of God.

I must therefore here humbly desire these worthy Authors, and others, that they consider well such expressions when they use them, that Ord. is the taking up the Ministry, a constituting Ordinance,

Ordinance, which if they conceive so, as if it gave the Ministry *errum deo*, I must invert that of the Father, *mentis in ore, lingua* *corripit*, and say, if they will keep their words, they must correct their apprehension. I do like well indeed to see the meaning of this Author to be so full, who thinks that to be re-ordained, does offer injury to our Ministry it self, as if we did thereby *even recede from our Office*, (the contrary whereof is true) or vacate our Ministerial Acts, which might well highly provoke his quickest worth and zeal against it; but when perhaps he hath let his thoughts cool a little more on the matter, he may come to conceive with us, that the Ministry it self is not conferred by our Orders at the first, and consequently that it cannot be endamaged by being re-ordained in the least, but that these Orders first and last both do operate upon, or to the same, only by way of declaration before men, for the reception of us in the Church, where we are (as hath been said) no otherwise, than we see the like of Princes as to their Kingdoms, in the instances now mentioned, and scarce yet out of sight.

And here I cannot say, but we may divide perhaps between the Ministry it self, and our Orders; the Ministry, which is from Christ, and his institution alone, and Orders which are of man. Let us be allured in the first place, that our Ministry, or Office it self, receives no damage by these second Orders, (which a man does not indeed recede from, but cleave to thereby) and the great fear is over; and as for our former Orders barely, whether they receive any injury hereby or no, it may be perhaps another matter. For my part I must acknowledge that there is injury offered to the same, but I will not say hereby, in what we do. The doing injury is one thing, and the suffering injury is another; we are here but sufferers. It is a Christians duty to bear injury when he must not do it. Let me say then, it is even the duty of these first Orders of ours, to suffer wrong in this case, so long as it is not from us who cannot help it. The wrong is, that we cannot enjoy that right we should have by them, and while by taking new, we do but pursue the same ends of setting off our Ministry, or giving it its free passage, for which we took them at first, and cannot now have it upon their score: they ought (as I may so say) to be content with us, and put it up from the timer. We do not ourselves, think the worse of them for being vilified; Besides,

let the Bishop think them to be null, and we think them to be Good, our thinking is nothing to the thing it self, if they be valid indeed, and according to truth, they will be so, whether others think so or no; and we go no more from any thing we have by them, by taking new, than we do go from the wealth we have, when we get more.

What then is the matter here in good earnest? Why the doing this, you may say perhaps, will at least make men think our former Orders to be null, though they be not, and this is something. I answer, no, you cannot say so much as this, for it may make them think only, that they will not pass in these times, and that a man is forced therefore to do but the same thing *legally and canonically*, which was done otherwise before; and this is that no doubt, but most think indeed, as the plain truth, according to the vulgar reason, although we may put it in the fairer words (if we will) of some moderate Bishops themselves, that our former Orders are *lawful before God and the Church, but not legal, according to the Order of the Nation*. And yet is not this the point indeed neither at the bottom, what others may think (while the objection is that we renounce or relinquish our former Ministry thereby) but what they may think, we think our selves in the doing hereof, or upon what account it is we do it. I have therefore framed my answer, in my former sheets to this Objection, thus; that I humbly judge, "So long as a man doth clearly and unfeignedly, both before and after, as he hath occasion, declare himself to the contrary, this will not I hope by the Lord, and ought not by man, to be laid to his charge, because expression in this case, does give construction to the action. The Bishop you may say, does hold our former Orders null, and requires new; If we yield, Do not we in the fact grant the same? I say again, No; If we declare otherwise, and yield not to the fact on that account, for I must give St *Ambrose's* due memento here, *Si ratio reddenda sit pro omnino isto verbo, cave etiam aliquando ne de vitioso silentio*. I have cleared this, by the instance of the *Reubenites*, *Jos. 22.* which methinks, may satisfy the ingenuous; though in the application, for those words, *we have been content* (p. 57.) I wish I had put *we have forced our selves*, for that is more, I find for my own part, than I am even yet able to say. *Flecte mihi cor meum Domine, mi Deus, confiteor enim hac tibi, & indulgentiam peto.*

That which is replied by this Author, and by Mr. C. in effect both, is this only. *Protestatio non valet contra factum*. I answer; There may be a Fact of a man which contradicts his Profession in the nature of the thing it self (as I might perhaps take some of their instances, but that I should fill too much Paper to speak to them) and here it is true (if it be so) a mans Protestation cannot prevail against his Fact; Or there is a Fact of a man that contradicts his Profession only in the conceit of some persons, but does not do so in the thing it self, nor in the estimation of others that judge aright of it; And in this Case, it should be apparent methinks, that the Fact must receive interpretation by the mans declaration; For while some may judge one thing of it, and some another, it is they only can judge charitably, that take his own account of it. Had the setting up of the *Altar* by the *Rubenites* been Idolatry in the thing it self, or had they done it really to estrange themselves from the God of *Israel*, their Protestation had been nothing to justify their Fact; but when it was indeed no such matter, but only judged a *renunciation*, by their mistaken Brethren, their Profession we see alone did honestate the Act, and gave all satisfaction: Such is truly I deem our Case in this Objection.

And now I am methinks something engaged to take into farther cognizance the main Body of that other Book I have mentioned, the Tenour of whose Discourse does run thus, *Re ordination does accumulate nothing to the validity, liberty, or dignity of our Ministry*. which he descants upon in several learned Pages, and therefore we may not be re-ordained. For which methinks, I would write only, that Re-ordination does super-induce the Canonical Stamp of allowance in the present Church, upon our Ministry, and so propose it back to him, whether therefore we must not be re-ordained? To speak to this, I must first in the way take notice, that when Divines do tell us of the validity of an Ordinance, I perceive by some words of *Austin* about Baptism, they account, that when there is the essentials of an Ordinance, then is the Ordinance valid: In which sense, it is not to be conceived, that we who have exercised our Ministry several years upon our first Orders, should doubt in the least of the validity thereof, which this very ready Author alone (if there were not a world besides) hath sufficiently proved

proved: But when we speak of the validity of Orders, in this dispute, I would have it understood as to the effect. I answer then to this Authors whole discourse, with that one distinction I have in my first Sheets, which I believe himself by this time will yield to be too true; And that is, "The validity of our former Ordination may be taken either in regard of what it *ought* to do, or in regard of what it *does* do: I say there, that the Orders we have first, *ought* to give the same outward authority, liberty, acceptation to our Ministry, as Episcopal Orders, but they *do* not; They ought I count according to the Law of God, but they *do* not do so, according to the present constitution of our Church and Land; and hence is it men are re-ordained. I will put this in other terms, as more proper perhaps for these present Sheets: Ordination (I have said) is that which gives us the *Reception* as Ministers, in the Church where we are; Now there is the Right of this Reception, and the actual Fruition. I am perswaded that when a man is ordained only by Presbyters, it is the Will of God that the Church should receive him as an Officer of his, which reaches the Rulers to permit him the exercise of his Ministry, as well as the People to render their honour and obedience they owe to him for his works sake. If they will not receive him accordingly, let them look to answer the denial to his Lord; Nevertheless, in regard the Right of Reception is for Reception it self, and it is the actual enjoyment hereof is the end why a man does take Orders at all, to wit, that he may actually use this Calling, that his Ministry may have its present free passage in the Church, and in his Place, which he cannot have now unless he takes Episcopal Orders also, it is not enough that he hath the Right already, when the Fruition is farther to be sought, and lacking, but the same end, and engagement towards God, that put him upon seeking Orders at first, must now even put him upon Re-ordination.

And here I will not forget before I go off, to re-mind my Reader, that when I make this *Reception*, or free course of our Ministry, the End of Orders, upon which I build so much as I do, I in end it all the way only as *one end* thereof: There are two ends (besides the designation it self of the person, or the outward application of the *ius ad personam*) I do setly make, or apprehend of Ordination, which may be distinguished, as

ro the Ordainers, and the Ordained, and I desire it may be well observed; The *Acts* I count are the end of the Ordainers, the *Effects* of the Ordained.

The first and chief end (as most express) of this Rite, is, the commending a person to the Grace of God for this Charge of the Ministry that is now so solemnly laid upon him, which is all one as to say the seperating, consecrating, or sanctifying him by prayer, as to the Act of the Ordainers; and in the Effect as to the Ordained, the blessing, grace, presence, assistance of Gods Spirit upon, and with him, for his studies, work, and success, thereby obtained. *Præcipue servatur iste ritus, ut tota ecclesia communibus precibus deo ministerium vocati commendat, sayes Chemnitzius:* Which Prayers we are not to account to be *inanes* but though there is no promise (it is true) extant in Scripture, whereby God hath obliged himself to give Grace (or Gifts) in the administration of this Rite, as there is to the Sacraments; yet may our Faith be strengthened to expect some benefit more peculiarly upon these Prayers, when this Imposition of hands, according to Apostolical practice, is joyned with them, from such Texts, *Gen. 48. 14. Deut. 34. 9. Mar. 10. 16.* Provided only we take that of *Calvin* also wisely with us, *Quæritur an per externum signum gratia fuerit data? Respondeo, quoties ordinabantur ministri, precibus totius ecclesie fuisse deo commendatos, atque hoc modo impetratam fuisse gratiam a deo non autem virtute signi fuisse illis datam.* Neither may you argue here against Re-ordination. If we are to believe in God for this Grace, or Gift (as it is in *Timothy*) or Spirit of God, to enable us in our Office, to be given upon the Churches prayers now, then can it not be sought by prayer again: For, *Though the formality of the Function admits not, majus & minus (as Mr. C. himself speaks) yet the qualification of the subject may.* And not only so, but we have the Apostles impowered by Christ, yet *waiting for Power from on high, Lu. 24. 49.* And there is an instance hath been mentioned, that may also effectually satisfie us herein, and that is of *David*, who in his first appointing by *Samuel*, had the Spirit of God come upon him (to wit, for Government, or his Office) and yet is the solemnity repeated after (when there was need) without any more scruple at all for that matter.

The second End hereof. is the Conciliating to a person an

N

Authority

Authority in regard of men (which I make so much use of) that his Ministry be *received* (I say) thereupon by all in the Church where he is. This, as to the Act of the Ordainers, is their publick testimony, approbation, and declaration of him as called of God; and in the Effect to the Ordained, is this his *Reception* (I so much press) by the Church, as to the exercise of his Ministry, and acceptation with his people. Now though it be true (what I must finally inculcate) that our first Orders, or solemn approbation by the Presbytery, hath given us a *Right* from God, or from his Word, to this Reception mentioned: Yet seeing (I account) we cannot have the *Fruition* hereof without the Canonical allowance also of the Bishop, and it is the actual enjoyment hereof (I say) in the present exercise of our Function, and free course of the Gospel, is the ultimate end here without question we look at in Orders, it is this Reason must warrant a man in his submission, though nothing I know will the Imposition of Re-ordination.

There remains now the last Objection in my sixth Section, and that is from Baptism; Baptism cannot be iterated, therefore not Orders. My Answer to this is, There is not here *par ratio*, Baptism is a Sacrament, and there is a promise of Grace annexed to Sacraments, and that as to Baptism is Regeneration, which whether real or relative is but once, and therefore Baptism is not repeated; but there is no such Grace and promise to Orders. *Quod Baptismus non fit iterandus de re magna agitur*, sayes an eminent Doctor. And for the Papists then, *Quod Baptismi proprium est ad Ordines suos conferre*, he accounts not equal. See *Exam. Con. Trid. de charactere*. This is my Answer. Nevertheless, in regard that the dread which is upon mens Spirits in this thing, does mainly I think arise from hence, I thought good to add thus much farther upon Truths score, to wit, That howsoever the universal judgement of the Church stands firm against Re-baptizing now, yet we find in the Scripture, that there hath been some particular reasons, that even Baptism it self hath been repeated, and the former not renounced, but confirmed hereby. This is in the instance of *Act. 19. 5.* which I have opened there. For reply whereunto, my Opponent, after the quoting of *Vossius* against Re-baptization (which might as well have been a hundred) and

and *Optatum*, who hath belike a singular conceit that *Johns* Baptism to these Disciples was null, because it was after Christs Precept was given, who in the mean while forgot Iure that plain Text, *Jo. 3. 22. 23.* that *Jesus* baptized (which was by his Disciples, *Ch. 4. 2.* and they could nor do it without a Precept) when *John* did; I say, after this he comes to confession, in the end, of two or three literate Pages & grants these Disciples first Baptism good, and yet re-baptized, and not only so, but because *Johns* Baptism was *in eum qui venisset*, and Christs was *in eum qui jam venisset*, and so not the same *πολὺν ἢ ὀλίγως*, he adds, *there was as much ground to administer Christs Baptism after Johns, as Johns after Circumcision*; Here then is there a good plea for us. Whether a man is Circumcised or Baptized, Baptized into Christ to come, or already come; Circumcision and Baptism both was still an external entrance or admission into the Church and Covenant of God; and consequently, if the entrance into the Church may be solemnized more than once, the entrance into the Ministry may be so, I hope with less scruple. Thus we see not only that this Argument comes to nothing against us, but may happily be rather inverted for us; So that it fares here with this Author methinks according to those words of the Prophet, *Either the Bud does yield no Male, or if it do, yield, the Stranger (his Adversary) swallows it up.*

In the cloze I find methinks a little leaven in the mind of my Adversary, which it may be, some or other of my expressions, being not grave enough, or too much engaged, might raise. If I be culpable I am sorry, but for my part I shall return nothing of that nature, but my respects, which he hath merited I count highly, that he hath been to fair all along before. And as for what he objects, *why was not Mr. H. as tender to be re-ordained to stop the mouth of peevish people hitherto, as well as now?* I wish heartily that the answer were not so easy as it is, to wit, *causa patet.* It was little glory to *Paul* that he was a Pharisee, in comparison of his being a Christian, and yet in how much stead did a seasonable owning thereof stand him in? *Act. 23. 6.* Religion it self may then sometimes put a man upon policy, & that leaden Rule of *tempori aptari*, have a golden & pious construction, when a Christian for a good end, does accommodate himself to others present spirit and affections. I see this man does think, that if he, or other like worthy persons, should

do as I have done, the better sort of their hearers would be so offended, as to leave them; but if by the better, he means the *sober* as well as the pious, I dare undertake for them, that if he cannot otherwise enjoy his Ministry, they shall go near to be the first, to advise him to it. For my part, when I see a worthy Minister of Christ, that doth much good, and Ordained in these times, and another who is *a thing in Pastors cloathing*, ready to despise him as no Minister, only because he had not the same Orders himself hath, and many of his Parish joyn thoughts with him; Methinks a kind of pious scorn and just indignation only might serve him, to let such know how easy this Ceremony might be had if he pleased. And truly as for some young men who have been taken by Presbyters into Orders, for their piety, and gifts, and not the University sake; I should be apt to advise such hereunto, of choice, (if their Consciences serve to hold out) for the sake of the Gospel, lest their Ministry else in short time come to be contemned, when men of known learning, if they stand out, are not subject to that disparagement; Nay farther, whereas it is in the mouths of most, that unless they do this, they can have no preferment, and that is judged a carnal argument (as this Author at first bespeaks his friend to that purpose) We are to consider well, before we condemn any. If a man shall think Re-ordination unlawful, and be tempted to do it upon preferment, the Lord rebuke the temptation, and forgive him. If he think it lawful, and some conceived advantages besides the Gospel draw's him in, when else he is loath, this argues the mind unfixed, and does also need mercy. But if a man is destitute of a place, and merely for the service of God in his calling, because he cannot else have another, does submit hereunto, and call this *preferment*, you may pardon the mans words, but his meaning is such, as includes the true end, why the thing indeed is to be done. I say not this to *entice* any to go on farther in these times, than their hearts serve them, or that they should not consider when they do this, how far they are to pass besides: He is a wary person, that will go in at no gate at first, until he is assured well, all the others also, that lie in his way, are open. But I speak it, because the great concernment of the Gospel, the burden of the work, the pleasure and readiness of the flesh, to be discharged, the self-denial in bearing the brunt, and the incumbent

tumbent duty (as men are best fit for doing service) are not weighed likewise as fully, I doubt upon the contrary. And so I have done with this Opponent, and what I have said to him, may suffice I hope for Mr. C. also, for he that answers the one, must also (as to the main) answer the other. I remember the Comedian,

*Menander fecit Andriam, & Perimbiam;
Qui utram vis rectè noris, ambas noveris.*

There remains at last an Epistle in the beginning of his Book, which does particularly oblige me to him, for his undeserved good thoughts of me, as *Vir doctus, candidus, & pacis ecclesie studiosissimus*; I must confess, I find not my self entirely pleased with the first of these titles, which yet he advances superlative kindly in the Inscription. It is an easy matter for a man in writing a few sheets, to observe some passages himself, and take the notices he meets with in his common reading out of others, with some sparred sayings, as fall in every where, and so seem learned (perhaps in such helped sentences) when his learning is indeed but scanty, mean, and ordinary.

Micum habito, & novi quam sit mihi curia supellex.

I dare not therefore at parting, assume to my self this favour of his, lest my Maker condemn it in me for pride, which in him is courtesie; Only I must take notice justly as to this Author, that the more true worth and learning there is in a man himself, so much the more ready is such a one to the fairest construction of another. *Quod summè desideret homo, est benignitas ipsius.*

Thus is this heavy work at last dispatched off my hands, which I count so, not only in regard of the harder travel through my great indisposition, in the birth of it, but also in regard of the fruit, while my tender and pious Brethren, whose turns it should serve, (and so the Church in them) have so many things more to stick at besides this, that they are like to be quite heartless, as to their regard or acceptance hereof; Yet could I not break off the thread begun, but God who rules our spirits, wills, and the event, would have it run its

length out, although I must say, I could scarce ever come to it; but with a mind full of Clouds or trouble, for which cause I have been forced often, first to have besought heaven; when this good man (my Adversary) methinks trips over my Book, touching things only as he goes along, *tanquam canis ad Nilum*, with his foot dipped in Oyl, and a mind that is free and at ease. Yet must I humbly leave it to the Lord now at last, by whom he will save *Israel*, by him that boweth on his knees, or him that lappeth.

SECTION X.

I Have now done with this fair Adversary in all things that may be a stumbling block to my pious Brethren, whose case I will suppose to be such as makes this matter of Re-ordination to become necessary, to the exercise of their Ministry in their place; And in that necessity I am humbly perswaded (with trust in mercy) that the Lord, who is pleased to bring them by his good providence into the same, will allow them to submit to it, so long as their hearts and aims be sincere to him in the doing. I know indeed, our Spirits are ready to harbour fearful thoughts of the present growing Hierarchy, as if it were some dangerous thing to yield to it, though no more than to receive an Imposition of hands from it, in our case: But the memory only methinks of those blessed Martyrs, *Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper*, and such late pious men as *Lake, Hall, Usher*, who were all Bishops of the same constitution with ours now, should remove such kind of impressions; And our larger Charity, at least toward others, heal our mis-givings toward our selves, when there are such multitudes involved with us in the case; I hope verily there is no more evil in Re-ordination upon that account, than in Ordination, though it be indeed a very uncouth Imposition. Let every good man on Gods name, be fully perswaded in his own mind (for I know not what the aboding of some mens hearts may mean) and take heed also to others, while he looks that there be weighty cause for what he does, lest the offence that is taken by his Brethren, affect the Lord with a like displeasure at it, and make him know, to his cost, how wary he had need

to walk in those very things which are indifferent to him in their Nature, when they be dangerous perhaps in their example, for the sake of others, at this tender season. It may therefore after all this be said to me, that while I am opening the Gate for my Brethren to pass, it is as it were with the wrong hand, so that I cannot go through my own self at the same, whose Condition hath not been altogether such as theirs, and as I plead for, to justify a person in this thing. It is the old rule in our Metaphysicks, *Entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate*. And I must confess I was put on this thing on the sudden, and unremoved from my place, that is, before I was aware, and before it was need. Now I see what this honest Monitor advises (p. 2.) that a man should have *pectus praparam*, & consequently not do a matter of this nature before he be better satisfied in every circumstance, than I could probably so soon. I see more particularly, he bids me *weigh* in the point of scandal (which hath indeed been sore to me) whether I *endeavour'd first to satisfy my Brethren about me*, which I have quoted before. And it appears in the *over-hastiness*, as he admonishes me likewise (p. 64.) a kind of *virtual or interpretative justification of those that require it* (when I dare undertake only on the part of those that submit to it) *And some prejudice to others also, by a petition to the King which might prevent it* (p. 70) for which I should be sorry indeed, if it were so: Besides the failings in the Ground, or End, and manner of performance, which is apt to accompany Precipitancy in all actions. As to all which, for ought I see, I must answer with acknowledgement, *This witness it true*, as the Apostle speaks, *Tit. 1. 13.*

Pudet hac opprobria nobis

Et dici potuisse & non potuisse refelli.

I must crave liberty therefore here to divide between my Opinion and my Fact. There is no necessity, when I justify Re-ordination, and my Brethren in their submission thereunto, that I should therefore become the Pharisee, and justify my self: I may acknowledge a culpability in my performance, and condemn it, through the failing of Circumstances, when yet I maintain my cause, and my Brethren, who in the uprightness of their hearts may have done this thing, & have peace in it. I dare not really say this was well in me, I will say rather, *Quis intelligit errores suos, munda me Domine, a deflexione mea*. There

is no man, as well as I, but when a thing in the main seems to him lawful, may be mistaken in the application thereof to his own condition. *Humanum est errare, labi, decipi.*

I confess I did not doubt in the least when I did this, but that my former Ordination was valid, and in the taking this new upon me, I find it is like a double garment put on for the fashion, and experiencedly proves uneasy to be worn. I must needs say, I could never imagine, so small a matter would have run so in my thoughts, as this hath done; it is indeed methinks to me, like a heavy Rugg upon my bed in the Summer, that to be under it makes me sweat, and I cannot well go to my rest till I have fairly jostled it off again, when others perhaps, of a complexion more cool, may be glad they have it on. Let it suffice, I have shewn my good will toward conformity, and have enough for once. My judgement is still as large as it was, but my heart is made afraid. I shall not step a foot further by Gods grace, henceforth than I see (or judge) my way safe, and my Soul clear.

I perceive that a Christian is not only to weigh the matter he does conform to in these times, but he must weigh well also his own spirit, whether he can bear it, when he hath done it. It is not enough that a thing is lawful or *honestum*, but that it be τὸ πρέπον, also, *decorum*, what is fit, not base, nor unworthy of him. I must confess in my apprehension, it is a thing not worthy of the Spirit of a Christian, who is not to be the servant of man, to be captivated barely to opinion and custom, in such petty things as Re-ordination in it self seems to me to be; and it is methinks to have ignoble thoughts of the Divine Nature, to think that God should be moved at that which he hath neither commanded, nor forbidden, though he looks indeed at our ends in every thing that they be upright to him. As I shall thank God therefore, though I have born this part for the sake of my Brethren, that upon my example they may not be held by superstition against what is needful for their own condition and the yielding on necessity (we may judge) saves the guilt of consent to the enjoying:) So now I have done, and apprehend it not to be worthy without that need as to me, I can be content it be to me, but as *Jeremies* Girdle, that is, profit me nought, whiles I care not to look for any other advantage by it. Even as *David* when he had longed for the Waters of *Bethlehem*, and his

his Worthies had fetch'd it to him, he judg'd the thing so ill, to have hazarded the life of those valiant men, upon such an account, when it was not on necessity, or for the saving of his own, that he laid this penance, as just on that appetite of his, that caused it, to deny and cross it, so that he would not drink thereof, but powred it upon the ground. I could willingly do something the like with these Orders of mine, if I have hazarded any of my worthy Brethrens Consciencés by Scandal in the doing.

It is truly an irksom thought sometimes to me, to hear how some of our Bishops do expect not only that a man should be Re-ordained, but that we should think our former Ministry to be null too, until that be done. If this indeed (as one might think) were personated only, it would vex a man to the heart, that ever any of us should yield to be so un-ingeniously dealt withall; but when we see the *real* confidence with which they carry it, so that for ought I see, they do believe themselves verily in it, insomuch as some of them when they have done, have bid those whom they have Re-ordained, to repent of their Minist'ring the Sacraments before, it may overcome our indignation methinks into a melting affection, or smile at the conceit, and make us bear with them. As if indeed the Bishops name were distinguishedly in *Christs Charter* for Ordination, as it is in the *Canons* of men; or as if any should tell me in earnest, that the *Lavne* were *de essentia* to the Ceremony, and the hands availed not without the Sleeves on.

The truth is, while there was some fair and lively hopes of an accommodation between Episcopacy, and the sober and moderate of the Presbyterians and others, according to his Majesties gracious Declaration, the business of Conformity, according to Primitive Pattern, might look something lovel; but now it hath pleased those that sit at the Helm of these things, to carry their affairs so high, that our expectations that way are cut off, and the *thirsty of the Land*, after some good issue thereof, *made to fail*. I do not know of what consequence the removing from our Station at first may be, or to what Rock it may come. When *Paul* had presaged the Voyage to be dangerous, and the minds of the Shipmen mis-give them themselves, though the winds blew softly, and the temptation was strong, the Centurion did not well to set out, or venture on, and to

I leave the fair *Havens* behind. Unless I could be sure my heart would serve me to hold throughout, and I could see safety there, at the end, I will not stand the danger of having gone so far, but will rather discount my action, and crave mercy, than look to be justified by what I have done. A Traveller goes on his way, and comes to two Ditches, he makes a shift to get over one, but then seeing another so broad, and how deep he knows not, he steps back. I do perceive I have made so large a stride at once, though in a little thing one would think, that I have left most of the wary and considerate of my Brethren behind me, I mean such at least, where necessity or a remove to a new charge, hath not made their case more clear than mine was; and I am so much convinced of the piety and integrity of many, or the most of them, that I can be contented methinks, that my Soul should be amongst theirs, (though my eye-sight as yet does differ,) to fare no otherwise than with them in state and Conscience, who have been my former fellows, and are yet quite free from all act or acts whatsoever, in or about this matter. I do consider what I make my Pen to utter, and I do beseech the Lord, unto whom the secrets and reasons of the heart is known, that I may stand in my spirit before him, or in my reckoning between him and my Soul (how ever in Mans Court I stand) according to the same.

Not that I will be enslaved to narrow up my faith to their standard, or tie up my judgment to any party, but I will acknowledge such mens sober practice, and good conversation. And as for those rules of their life, to confess Jesus Christ, to take heed of offending any of his little ones, to own the grace of God in his Children, to prefer in the esteem of heart, the power of godliness, before the formality and garments of it, I cannot but be convinced by them, and carry in my mind that exhortation of the Apostle, *My Brethren, have not the faith of Christ in respect of persons*, in which due regard as Christian, what is the Bishop more indeed than the *Pawn*, or the *Knight* than a single man, which though they may in all external honour due to them, stand for more upon the board, yet must they be but all one in the bagg, and in their accounts before the Lord.

I know indeed *Quod factum est*, when a thing is done, *infestum fieri non potest*, it cannot be undone in the act it self, but yet it may in the effect, or the effects. It is a gracious Text in

Jeremy,

meremy, In those dayes, and in that time, saith the Lord, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the sin of Judah, and they shall not be found. What we find here was committed, but Gods favour and pardon puts them into such an estate, that it is as good for them as if there were none, or all one in the effect, as if it had never been at all. When a man shall come to find the same freedom of spirit, the same boldness of access in the sight of the Lord, the same exercise of Grace to, and influence of his Face from him, it is all one in the effect toward God. When the sad impressions shall be wiped out of his mind, when the sanctified experience shall be left, and the bitterness be over, the regret and torment be no more, it is all one in effect towards himself. When his blood and courage, chearfulness & life, shall be returned in the sight & presence of his Brethren, and to the duty of admonishing, hearing and quickening them in the same faith, and the same Lord; here it is all one in respect of others. In short, when supposing a man hath taken new Orders, but is ready to stand to, & (preservation considered) make use of his old, being content to fare no otherwise than those that have not, or as he should have done before. Here methinks they are all one to him, as if there were none.

Were the Ministerial Office given by Orders, as the Bishop holds, and we in our case took his Orders for this end as he gives them, then could they not be retained by us, but should be null'd, and acknowledged in vain: but if we take them to another end, and that indeed not for our selves, but for the Canonical repute only to satisfy others, both must be held, or one spared as there is need, but the prebeminence must be given by us to the first born; which I have reason to speak, I count, both sadly by my experience, and soberly when I compare them; the more careful examination, solemn confession, pious exhortations, frequent prayers, that were at the former, may not be forgotten; So that the times only excepted, (to speak freely, and with no gall) a mans case alone must tell him which were to be chosen. *No man having drunk old Wine, straightway desireth new, for he saith the old is better.*

I understand very well, I write not now, as one that is like to thrive by it; I see the way I should have gone, if I look'd for that. I must write for truth, though with the loss of advantage; I must write for my relief, though with the hazard

zard of my name ; I do trust God with both, and I do even choose weakness and folly (if I may, as a Christian) to remove guilt, and a load off from me, before wisdom and strength to bear it like a man. I may be accused for weak to intimate any trouble, or for unwise to venture any loss; but if my weakness shall ease me, and my folly give me victory, that I may have done expecting any good from this World, and frail man, I shall remember that Text of the Apostle, *The Foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the Weakness of God is stronger than men.* And then say with good Lactantius, *Haerent divites suas divitias, haerent sapientes suam sapientiam relinquunt nobis nostram stultitiam.* Let those that are great, have their Riches and Dignities, those that seem Wise, their Wisdom, let them leave us the Foolishness of Integrity, and Simplicity of Christ.

Not but if one would be seeking, I might have stood as fair perhaps in the aspect of the times as another; Nor if that I were yet hardy enough, I foresee not what room is making for those that will, that none may say, he is moved to this by a failure herein. But I am made sensible, that to be grasping after present things, is to catch an arm full of thorns: I am made to perceive on what a brink we yet are, and that a man must know first what he can swallow well, that hath a stomach for all that comes. I would fain have both a better heart for it, and have done more good than where I have been, and if advantage came free, I should have bid it come, but if it come with fetters on my legs, or any intanglements on my Soul, I bid it farwel. The real hazard of solid good, as composure of mind, a retired frame, and a whole conscience, for the shew only of happiness, and ceremony thereof, is one of the vanities of man. It is not the bulk of riches, or dignities, but their extracted Spirits, which is the content of them, and the service of God by them, which is to be sought. It is but a very little can be enjoyed of the whole World. I was verily faulty, that prudential perswasion, and seeming concernment, did draw me more hastily, if not farther, in this thing, than else I should have gone; And it is really such an ugly thing to me, when one cannot down freely with every thing else, to be trapt into this, that I cannot endure it, do what I can; neither is it in the revolution of these thoughts which was my soar, can be my cure, but in the Abrenunciation of them. It is not a plication

casion of money will heal a wound, nor a dainty bir, or comfortable draught assuage the mind. There is a time with the Spirit of man, when he is not to be regarding outward good, and savour with men: *Seekest thou great things for thy self? seek them not.* I had rather, for my part, have peace only in my Conscience, and satisfaction to my heart, than a Mitre on my head, and a Rochet on my back. I had rather have my gracious Saviour Christ alone pleased with me, than all the Bishops, Lords, and Rulers of the Land. The fine Needle work on the Cap (as *Plutarch*, I think, somewhere speaks to that sense) does not help the headach; Nor the gilded Slipper the breaking of the Shin. It is the confession of evil, and the forsaking of evil, makes the Soul well: Let me but have the smile of God upon my Soul when I have done, and let others write for what they will, and get what they can. And what indeed were three or four hundred pound a year to reconciliation with God, and remission of Sin? *Lord lift thou up the light of thy Countenance upon us* (says *David*) and it shall be more cause of gladness to the heart, than the increase of Corn and Wine.

It pleased God in the late times, when the Ordinance of the Sacrament lay wast in many places, to draw me forth (as a man made for displeasure) upon the subject of Free-admission, which got the Tongues and Pens of many of my Brethren upon me then, and a very hard Character of me ever since. Divine Providence hath turned the scales of things, and I find there be those of other Complexions, in the same Religion, that have more Candour in their grains of allowance for my imperfections, and acceptation of my poor labours, being ready (as having served them something) upon the overture of occasion, to wipe out those *vibices nominis*, with the marks of a contrary nature. But those smilings perhaps now, I shall turn into wrinkling, and must be content; who do judge it hardly honest, indeed for any, to be ambitious of Favour, as to be vain-glorious of Grace, where they cannot stand sincere in it. I must needs say, I did not (as I remember) design at that time the serving any Party, or Interest; but that chiefly which I perceive does reign much in my heart, that is the interest of tender Consciences. who being in distress then upon so necessary a point of practice, I thought it might be a service acceptable

table to Truth and them, to offer the best relief I could against the stream of Separation: And as for men of another temper, it was not my joy (God knows) but my sad-fears, lest what I intended for the pious in the ease of their streightned Spirits, should be used by such of larger principles to their despite, and remissness in their own duty; If I have swerved in any thing therein, though in the least, I submit my self to the judgement of our Church, and the Scripture. I have at this time also, through Providence, been drawn out now upon this subject, made necessary likewise to many: I know it is stood upon as a matter of moment to Episcopacy, and a threshold to her; and I do not see that, so long as if men of Conscience come in, it must be the way they can, I could have counterfeited to her purpose so effectually, as in sincerity herein (I think) to the Church I have done, for I remember the *Comedian*, *Paulum interesse censet, ex animo omnia ut fert natura, faciat, an de industria?* And yet I must quit any claim of Grace, or engagement from her by this, who do herein desire, (or desire at least that I may desire) to serve no other end than the same of my dear Brethren, to wit, the relieving the tender in Conscience, the keeping such in the Ministry, together with the intents also (I must not deny) of all due, holy, Ecclesiastical Peace, which if I have hitherto pursued with more indifference, as to what kind of Government Providence please, then I ought, I crave mercy, who have not, I must confess, yet learned to *speake evil* of any. And while I am now little careful in these expressions, if my own heart be satisfied, what Party is pleased, or offended, I am methinks very fearful, lest any of those, whose case my Discourse does concern, be stumbled, or discouraged, who I hope will consider, how much more easie it were for me to lay aside my Opinion and Fast together, if there were for it, a truly full, and sufficient conviction, than to be put upon the distress of the distinction to uphold the one, and repent the other.

But why indeed should any be stumbled at me, when he is only made wary and set upon his duty? When I say Duty, I suppose it will be conceived still in reference to the use of a mans Ministry; So that if his Conscience stick otherwise, and he cannot pass besides, this may be lawful, and yet not obligatory, to do it in vain; And consequently if a man hath done it, and it is not

like to reach that end, upon the same account, the Case of a
 Recession, or testimonial Dereliction, is the same. And
 why should any be offended, seeing as *Antoninus* sayes, Εἰ μὲν
 ἡμᾶς τὸν ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος. If there be any hurt herein, it is to my
 self, what is it to them? And I have reason to know what is
 best for me. It is not now a time with me to be fearing what
 I shall lose, or what I shall suffer, but to take heed what I do,
 to confess him, who indeed ought to be our Fear. A Prison it
 self to the Body, is but Liberty to the carrying a Prison in the
 Thoughts; and the shackells on a mans leggs, are but
 light gear to a load upon the mind. *My Brethren*, sayes
St. James, Count it all joy, if you fall into divers Temptations. I
 remember *Ignatius*, when he is as it were provoking the Lyons;
 and his friends (I will suppose) looking upon him, and be-
 wailing in him too much forwardness towards his danger,
 and approaching Martyrdome, he thus bespeaks them, in
 his Epistle to the *Romans*, Συγγνώμην μοι ἔχετε, τί μοι συμφέρει
 ἔγω γινώσκω, νῦν ἀρχομαι μαρτυρίας εἶναι. You must pardon me
 my Friends, I do know what is best for my own self, now I begin to
 be a Disciple. Let me humbly say so; I am sensible these open
 words and acknowledgements of mine, are like to bring me in-
 to the mouths of Men, though not of Lyons; On the one side,
 my owning this unusual, and displeasing thing Re-ordination,
 in the Doctrine (though true, and never so necessary to
 others) and the not bearing up the Imposition, and my own
 Deed (though the Confession be never so honest and necessary
 to me) on the other side, will put me as it were between the
 upper and nether jaw of Censure, to be ground by the teeth
 of all that please, but I cannot help it, and so long as it is but
 what is from without, for my quiet from within, it shall I hope
 but serve only, as it were, to yield Meal to me, to feed me in
 heart (They shall be as Bread to us, sayes *Caleb*) and I shall
 bear it (through Grace) with vigor upon that account, which
 methinks I find even now in some measure returning like the
 blood and spirits to my heart, that hath been even quite down
 before, so that νῦν ἀρχομαι, Now I begin to come to my self,
 and consider that warfare wherein a man can never so well put
 on his harness, as when he is stript, and ready to forsake all:
 There be some Spirits made fittest to honour God in a case of
 confession, and some to honour him in wayes of facility and
 submission.

submission; I am perswaded the Lord Almighty will have enough to stand by him as his *Confessors*, and also to carry on his work, of the Gospel, as gentle, not opposing themselves, and bearing with the evil; and yet keeping each of them a good Conscience herein, being ready, as to preparation of mind, to choose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season. *Whoever shall be ashamed to confess me in this adulterous generation, of him shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of the Father.* Τίς ἂν ἑταίρος, θηλωτε συσδοεῖς, σιορπικμοὶ ὅστων, συμποδοι μελῶν, ἀλυσμός ὅλα τὰ σῶματος, καὶ κόλασις τὰ διαβολὰ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἐρχέσθω, μόνον ἵνα Ἰησοῦ Χριστὸν ἐπισύχω. *Let the Fire and the Cruelty (as that blessed Saviour and Martyr goes on) the coition of wild Beasts, the breaking of the Bones, the dis-jointing of the Members, the dissolution of the whole Body, and the Spue of the Devil come upon me, so long as I may be partaker of Christ Jesus.*

The truth is, the volubility of these times, have brought such snares on mens Consciences, that will require both the candour of our Rulers, and also much disquisition, and resolution in our own selves, to divide aright between the Gnat and the Camel, that when we do not strain at the one, yet we may not swallow the other. The same self-denial and mortification, it is in my thought, will not fit every condition. Methinks I see many good men with their *Isaac* bound in their hand, ready to lay him on the Altar; The Child of their hopes smiles upon them; they have pleasing opportunities, tempting advantages, stripping necessities, and they cry, Oh pity us! Oh do not put us under the knife! O spare us, do not cast us away. Alas! how a man feels his own frailty, whiles his bowels yerns at these cries! Well now (say they) if we should do thus, or hus, for our advantage, and shall come after for to be troubled in Conscience for it, when it is done, God may say to us, go to your advantages, and let them relieve you; you have what you sought, you get no more of me, and can they ease you? But if we shall deny our advantages to save our Conscience, and come after to find it nothing, or but a meer scruple for which we have relinquished them, and so are troubled for that, then may we go to God directly for our comfort, who we are sure can ease us, and by the testimony alone of our integrity, make up what we have lost. It is a noble instance of the famous

amous Marquess of *Nice*, who when his Honour, and State, and Wife, and Children hung about him, could shake off all, as the drops of rain, from his Cloak at once, for the sake of his Conscience. From which contemplation, I will humbly in the presence of the Lord, from henceforth lay down this rule (ingenuously acknowledging it to him, as my failing, that I had not laid it to my self, *animo obfirmato*, before) that when the Soul is in doubt about any thing, which it is like to be troubled for, either way when it is done, it must determine to take that way, which is most like to relieve it again, in that trouble. If my Conscience can relieve me against my advantages, and my advantages cannot relieve me against my Conscience, then let my *Isaac* be sacrificed, and my hopes be cast on the Lord, who can raise them up again if he sees good, when they are slain, but let not a man dissipate his Soul, and lose the comfort of his mind, if not also the peace of his Conscience, which is not to be recompensed with the world. And yet need we not be so narrow-spirited towards God, his Church, or Cause, (which is the promoting holiness and peace) but that as to others, and in other things, as to our selves, we may judge, that when a person hath found in the bottom of his Soul, wherein he is like to be most servicable to this grand end, he need not hide himself among the stuff, from the Providences, which without sin, lie before him. This being one top-step of denying ones self, to deny self-denial in its season. Through good report, and through evil report, by honour and dishonour.

Viri, fratres, & patres, Sinite me, nullius quamvis pretii hominum, cogitationes effuge oneratis pectoris, nimis anxias, ad animi agilitudinem sublevandam, aperire, & quasi in gremia vestra effundere, neq; agere ferre, neq; irascimini. Dolet, me sanè favori, humanitati, & indulgentia vestra adeò moleste inniti, ut saniam ejus copiam, quanta conditioni meae opus est, mihi facere, vos sollicitarem. Infelicitè quidem & haud satis auspiciat, res mihi gesta est, qui ad provinciam hanc scrupulosam suscipiendam, praepropere nimium me contuli, praesquam ad maturioris consilii calculos, totam revocassem materiam; qua mihi tamen non tantum molestia

molestia in disputando, quantum in onere præcipiis istius facti ferendo conflavit. De quo, licet uberiori orationis filo jam verba profunderim, nondum tamen acquiescens animus, intolerando hoc fasce, omnino se levare gestit.

Severissimus Rex nupera Declaratione injunxerat, ut Episcopus Presbyteros nonnullos ruri viventes accerferet, eosque in ritu impositionis manuum, & examine ordinandorum, sibi socios adjungeret. In observantiam hujus declarationis, Placuit Episcopo, ut & ego inter alios fuerim accersitus. Mihi hoc in casu, & æquum, & ad præsentem rem necessarium, visum est, non quò apologiam prætexerem, sed ut ingenuitati litarem, Episcopum submonere, me à solis Prasbyteris ordinatum esse, meq; istam ordinationem satis validam & sufficientem existimare. Quo facto ansâ hac de re inter nos benigne conferendi datâ, me ut primus ordinationem meam instaurare, non gravarer, neve opus desererem, per quàm amicè hortabatur. Are non parum alienus fui, sed in eam, tandem tantâ humanitate, suavitatè, & persuasionis vehementiâ, cui accessit quarundam familiarium etiam consilium, inductus.

Huc animum adveterant (ut credo) amici, & cogitationes defixerant, quo scilicet pacto in generatione meâ Deo potissimum inservire possem; Id quod, principiis meis quatenus palàm facta sunt perpensis, ad tempus præsens ut accommodem me, alliciebat. Verò enim verò, hic communis situs est lapis, in quem summa etiam probitatis viri aliquando impingunt, quòd in dando aequè ac in petendo consilio, non tam conscientiam solam & Dei gloriam, quàm prudentiam, & res nostras præsentem spectemus. Cogitabamus equidem, & probabilis quadam conjectura nos pascebat, nempe fieri posse, ut factum hoc præsentem mihi esset utilitati, quod isti consilio caput erat.

Non potui quin iterùm animo revolverem, nimirum aspernari favoris illecebras, & commodi allestamenta, nec quicquam illorum gratiâ committere, quod aliter quisquam facturus non esset, rari esse Christiano maximè dignam. Sed Eheu! Quis mortalium in hac vita scenâ omnibus numeris absolutus est? Cogitanti hæc, unica consideratio præter cetera, mentem meam, rursus mihi verberabat, quæ vel sola aliis fortasse omnem ex animo scrupulum eximere potuisset. Functio ministerialis mihi onus grave visa est, jam si iniquitas temporum ob Episcopalis ordinationis defectum, me ex istius officii dignitate exueret, quid aliud profectò ageres, quàm ut onere isto me levaret? Ac proinde novo me ordinis infirmo obstringere, tanquam

tanquam honesti alicujus, & sui ipsius abnegationis faciem pra se tulit, immo istud ipsum, officii, ad quod jam sejunctus eram, ratio postulare videbatur. Hoc novum commodis istis prominentibus faciem praeferebat, & subtilis hac tentatio (si quidem tentatio) captivum duxit, in aurem insuffratis, ista si recusarem, fore, ut conscientia mihi exprobraret me nihilo minus gratificari carni, desideria indulgendo, quam si istis indulgerem, & ita Christiana illa sui ipsius abnegationis consolatione privarer.

Unius tantum bidui spatium cogitandi mihi erat; obiectio scandalis palmaria, quae in re leviori, paulo ante me pupugerat, & ob id vel sola me retardare potuisset, aut debuisset mihi cum quodam e familiaribus colloquendi, hebes & stupida (minimè verò dicam, non prorsus omnino ulla) fortè reddita erat; Spes ingeniosa & peracuta affulgebatur. Res ipsa, in se indifferens, non contra conscientiam, astricta animi genium & ductum visa est. In formulâ ordinationis, quaedam verba Responsonibus inserta, ad ministrum spectantia, maximum scrupulum iniecerunt, & in quibus ego maxime harebam, ea alius fortasse sicco pede praterisset. Ut tandem huic malo remedium quoad potui adhiberem; verba ista paululum mutavi, & libertatem non subscribendi deposcebam. Jam nihil reliquum putabam, quod postea mihi negotium faceretur. Impreseniarum, & dierum duorum, vel trium intervallo, res omnis in vado erat; Sed paucis post, mens mea dubia & anceps esse cepit. Id imprimis metuebam tantum, ne in praecoceptis istis verbis claudicasset. Hic metus angit animum, & in varias de re ipsâ scrupulos conjecit: Hi scrupuli me aliis objectionibus immersece. Has objectiones annotare, & singulis prout mihi occurrerant, & me cruciabant, respondere, opera praeium dixi. Singulari Providentia manu credo factum, ac proinde priorem meam istam Diatribem conscribebam; Ex qua siquis fructum quendam perceperit, omnem soli Deo tribuo gloriam.

Quantum ad me attinet, mentis mea tranquillitas non adeò diù durabat. Quod hominis judicio est confirmatio, non semper est cordis satisfactio. Alterum huic librum in lucem emitto, & confessionem etiam subungere non verebar. Liber confessionum Augustinum cohonestavit. Ex quo enim Dissertatio mea dubitationum factus mihi composuit, quantum ad materiam Re-ordinationis, ante oculos obversabatur ipsum factum, ejusq; modus. Scio quòd Deus est justus, qui non affligit ex animo suo, meritiâque afficit filios viâ. Deliquisse me, memet judico, quia animi molestia affecti;

Meipsum iudico ne iudicet, & ab ipso condemnent. Quoad animi igitur desideratam praemunitionem, circumstantias concommittentes, agendi finem & allectamenta, me à crimine non libero. Praefestinationis mea me penitet. Homo agnoscit, ignoscit Deus. Ad cuius misericordiam confugere malim, & fratrum meorum commendicare preces, quam ex eo quod feci me iustum depradicare. Si eorum qua in lucem emisi me paeniteret, & mihi fortasse & aliis injurius essem; Non scripti (præterquam quod in omnibus peccamus) sed facti me piget. Fratribus meis in re per se licitâ patrocinaret, me vero ipsam, ob temeritatem ejusdem ad præsentem statum meum applicationem, purgare non aggrediar. Dum Concionibus intersumus, dum preces recitamus, interdum peccamus. Et quis est, qui non aliquando ea facit at, qua postea si omisisset, magis in rem suam fuisse comperit. ————— Quid enim ratione timeamus,

Aut cupimus! Quid tam dextro pede concipis ut te Conatus non poeniteat, vorique peracti?

Credebam, si necessitatem ad intercludendam omnem è vineâ cui devinctus eram, elabendi viam mihi injungerem, fore ut mens mihi in opere defixa, in illud minus vacillanter, tota incumberet; sed non sine dolore profiteor rem mihi non addeò feliciter cecidisse. Et recipia ex perior, me jam ante satis obstrictum, hoc posteriori nodo adeò implicatum affligi, ut diutius tollere non possem, quin ultimum relaxandi & explicandi tentarem viam. Avertat Deus me ulterius progressurum ob hoc factum, quam salvâ conscientia aliter nequirem.

In eum locum jam res rediit, ut nonnullis, nihil, nisi plena conformitas in omnibus, siue novis siue pristinis arridet, quibus an unquam me totum dedere, animum recolligam posthac, non satis scio. Videor igitur mihi videre, mecum quidem hic agi, perinde ac cum homine, qui in foramen quoddam irrepsit, ibique capite & humeris immissis haeret; nec totum corpus suum post se attrahere, nec sine corpore quò se vertat, habet; Anteriorem idcirco corporis partem, quam commodissime potest retrahere cogitur; Quod dum facit, si caput suum salvum & incolume tueri potest, illa sionem quandam aliarum partium aquanimiter feret, atque satis bene actum secum putabit.

Hoc sanè pro comperto habeo, hanc Re-ordinationem, maximam esse ad quamcunque aliarum impositionum materiam, sine percolatione deglutendam, inescationem, ne quod jam concoxi, effectum careat, & irritum videatur. E contra mihi subolet, si tantum
hoc

hoc vix factum (omnium fortasse non minus informe) jam mentem meam adeo morardit, quid fiet si prater hoc, ad mores scena hujus quasunque me composuero? Sunt instinctus quidem interni, & mentis hallucinationes, quæ rationem superant; nec satis scio, an quid periculi latentis maneat illi, qui se presenti generationi deditover, in re licet pusilla, vel quousque ego progressus sum, eo quod Genius meus, ad canendum receptus, quo in pristinam stationem regrediar, adeo indefinenter aurem vellicans me exsuscitat, subinde submurmurans ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτῶν, discede à teutorijs, ἔγῳ οὐκ ὀνῶν ὁ ὡς τοῦ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν. Sed hoc certe scio, & nimis exploratam habeo, Ex quo hoc feci, irrequieta mihi mens redditur, & internâ pace vix noctu vel interdum, nisi valeitudinariâ, frui potui: Tot facti istius fuere concomitantia memoria displacentia, quorum extimescenda imagines, & nova imaginationum commenta, & terrores occurrunt, quæ tanquam furia (ut cum Tullio loquar) respirare non sinunt, & (ut cum Terentio) nec consiliis locum, nec remedijs copiam relinquunt. Ab omnibus igitur & singulis mihi impetranda est venia, adhibendi inusitatum aliquod, sed efficax remedium, quod animum meum ex hoc ergastulo ætutiam ut potero, ad semel, & ad semper (favente Deo) expediam.

Non possum quin ex animo doleam, me ad hoc compelli; absq̃ quo esset, causam non video cur non presenti foro felisciter aq̃, ac alijs quam plurimi mei ordinis, uti potuero. Sed ita optimo maximo visum est, ut aTio ea quæ maximè, & favoris & emulamenti mihi conciliandi, speciem præ se ferebat (quantum ad effectum attinet, quem huc me impellendo, certo certius (ut vereor) tandem consequetur), ad utriusq̃ ascensum, quam maximè viam occluderet, & penitus me amandaret. Quod ille bene veriat precor. Facturæ quidem unius timor, & captatio alterius, occasionem (quantum sentio) mea in hoc negotio claudicationis præstitere: Jam verò utrumq̃, periclitari, & conscientia paci unice studere; Quanti ad Dei gloriam interfit inquirere, & omnia cetera mea in promptu illi posthabere, Christianam quandam compensationem fore spero, quamq̃ ab illo, acceptam fero. Immo quantâ vindictio? 2 Cor. 7. 11. Præstat certe nobis Deû nomen magni facere, per confessionem nostram, & Christiano pudore suffundi, quam peccatum retinendo, dignitatem aucupari, & ad manum temporum turriâ adblandiri. Den quod Divinâ aspirante gratiâ, ego nunquam genuinum natura mea ductum, concordia istendendû, & conscientijs seniorum fra-

trum (in quantum possum) succurrendi, sequi desinam; Immo se quem virum probum videro, qui sine ulla mentis intemperie ad omnes presentis scena articulos componere se potest, gaudio afficiar, nec ingenium ejus improbem; At mihi tamen, potius quam ipse diutius talem agam visum, in qua, nec Deo, nec Hominibus, inservire possum, omnis lapis est movendus, ut quo vis modo, quavis conditione, ex his angustiis emergam. Tu quisquis es, qui paratus astas ut me judices, accedas propius, & rem omnem a principio audi, ac modo candidus sis & sincerus Christianus, nullam mihi, neq. imprudentia, neq. indigni alicujus facinoris notam inures, sed potius sedato animo & placido recedens, necesse est, bene est, optime factum, acclamabis.

Si Episcopi a solis Præbyteris Ordinatos pro verè ministris habent, & quibus confirmatio in super Canonica arridet, eam amplecti, alijs, quorum conscientia illam averfatur, eadem superfedere, liberum, & quasi indifferens relinquatur, Si summa ratio non diceretur, æquitas saltem Christiana postularet, moderationi, sive pietatibz, tali, gratificari nos debere, qua quidem nobis cum primum nostrum quam plurimi ordinationem suam renovarent, affulsit; porro alterum alteros ferre, & uniformi (quantum sua cuiusq. conscientia tulerit) pietatis operari. Nec esset, quod qui se conformarent eos quos vocant Non-conformantes, contemptui haberent, nec hi illos vicissim judicarent, Ro. 14. 3. Si vero Ordinationis innovatio exigatur, ob hanc potissimum rationem, quod pristina nostra Ordinatio exautorata, & pro irrita habenda est, quasi nulla in nos a Christo auctoritas, nisi per Episcopum derivari possit, omnesq. qui illam exosculari erubescant, functione ministeriali (quod averruncet Deus) excludendi sint, Certè fratres, hoc in casu, contumelia adeo gravi, adeo indigna afficerentur, ut ego quippè solus adhuc causa huic palam & ex confesso devinctus, non immerito ab illorum castris, meoq. pristino Ministerio, transfuga viderer, si non in eodem me cum illis conjungerem, meq. sua sortis participem facerem; Si non & injuriam quam fortè intuli resarcire, illisq. in omnibus quoad potero satisfacere, paratus fuero; cum res non levis momenti sit; utpote que ad Dominum qui operarios in messum mittit, & ad operarios ipsos, hominumq. animas spectet, & cum regula illa visa, Non dimittitur peccatum donec restitatur ablutum, nihil minus fortasse a me efflagitare videatur.

Noverint igitur universi & singuli quicunq. volunt quod ego
J. H. Ordinatus a Classe Præbyterorum An. 1649. Et Ordinatus
denu

denudat Episcopo An. 1660. Palam, in Divine majestatis gloriam, & conscientia mea pacem, profiteor, viz. Quamvis Ordinationis institutionem in quibusdam casibus licitam, & verbo Dei consentaneam esse credam, & in proximum ad eandem propugnandam festi, ita ut neminem alium, hac in re, labe aspergam; Quoniam tamen hic defectus proprii, siue multo potius, defectum meorum convictus sum, meq; non recte fecisse, cui in loco quo remansi, cum alijs confirmato, hoc neuiquam, vel saltem nondum, opus erat; Precipue quoniam ad sancitati pectoris vulnus, idemve conscientia sanandum, nihil ferè intentatum reliqui, & cetera omnia plane desperata sunt, ut quo me veritam aliter, non habeam; Ut nihil de formæ incongruitate enarrem, cujus causa ad Diaconatum veluti ὡς ἔντες ἰὺς ὄρον (ut loquuntur) descenditur; qua quidem consumelia est (quo penitius intueor) indignatione omni ingenuâ & liberali, vere dignissima: Ego uliro, & spontaneo ductu, a nemine, nisi a manu Dei impulsus, & verè ἀνυπόκριντος, totum illum actum & alius quoscunq; siue voluntate, siue verbis, siue facto, quibus nimis temere, & non satis consideratè, in, circa, aut ante, ordinationis istam institutionem, me subjeci, quorum panitere, & dolere me fateor, immò & confiteor coram Domino Deo meo; Retracto, revoco, abduco, abrenuncio, derelinquo, procul abjicio, eaq; cum quibuscunq; ad ea pertinentibus, per has presentes literas, quantum in me situm est, facta infecta, seducta & peritura, & pissa totè expuncta, & abduco omnia. Et in illo die spernent quisque sua idola, Seperabis ea, & apage dices eorum cuique. Deniq; ut paucis expediám, cum mihi persuasum omnino habeam, priorem meam ordinationem fuisse, & esse satis validam, ego me in pristinum meum statum confero, eiq; adhærebo. Ita quidem eò tandem ventum est, ut dum Episcopalis Ordinationi, priori nostræ insultare, & in irricam illam reddendo, blandiri sibi admodum videtur, accidis illi rectissime, secundum illud Propheta. Propinquus est dies Jehovæ; Quemadmodum feceris, fiet tibi, retributio tua revertetur in caput tuum.

Nonnulli forsan animum induxere, fore, ut posteritas a tam
nobile hoc secundo deo ordinatis, exemplum & testimonium sibi su-
meret, ad ~~imitandum~~ ^{imitandum} in posterum Presbyterorum Ordinationem,
id cum non possit non praebere maximam Ecclesiae reformatae trans-
marinae offensionem, aq̃ ac Reverendis nostris in Britannia fratri-
bus: Etiam, per me, scriptis mandetur, quod hunc in finem, sive
hanc in rationem & sententiam, nos quidem minime gentium huius
usum subiecimus; Absit longissime, sed in id incubimus potius
Re-ordinationem

Re-ordinationem (rem quamvis insolentem Ecclesia) propugnaremus, quam nostram priorem pro invalida & in cassâ haberemus; Fateor hâc in re, me ad Episcopale regimen colendum, nimis proclivem aliquibus videri posse; Sed nulla ego revera Hierarchica affector gloria, norâ istius nominis insigniri, sed potius si ultra quam incum est prolapsus sim, hoc erit mihi pro victoria ex caractere isto, si ad apocalypsim ita alludere, mihi licuerit. Porro & in posteros feratur, quod ego ipsemet, qui alijs praeui, & difficile opinionis huius defendendi onus fratrum meorum simul ac mei ipsius causâ, in me suscepî, licet opinionem hanc meam pro virili tuear, tamen Facti istius conscientiam ferre nesci, & difficultates infandas, praesertim ut indies jam res se vertant. Ob id penitentiam hanc, ingenuam & publicam, libere egi, isti q; valedixi.

Sapo equidem rationes meas mecum subduxi, quo nempe pacto, juxta naturæ genium, conscientiam & conditionem, honore Deum officere quam maxime potero; Et jacta est jam mihi alea, qua & optimè huic vitæ proposito evenit; Quocirca, in huius rei testimonium, me scilicet, neq; ex parte se subjectantium voluntarium, (quoad principia quæ propter exigitur) alicujus assensum, sed submissionem duntaxat ad exercitium Ministerij & liberio rem evangelij cursum hâc vice necessariam, approbare; ad fratres meos, ut una cum illis conjungar, una gratis prædicem; aus ejiciar, una deniq; mala aut bona quacunq; subeam, me recipio. Faxit Deus ut omnia Ecclesia feliciter succedant. Et Itaq; dixit Davidi, in quocunque loco tu eris, sive ad mortem; sive ad necem, ibi futurus eris. Servus tuus,

J. H.

SECTION XI.

AFTER the finishing this second Discourse upon this Subject, there is a third Book come out against me on the same, entituled, *A peaceable enquiry about Re-ordination*, under an unknown Name, like the former. I wish rather an acquaintance with the Author, to embrace him in my love, than to scratch him with my Pen; whom I receive as another person of learning, industry, candour, and worth. I am now from my Study and Bookes, and cannot bestow that time and examination upon his labours as they require; I shall sit down only as it were, and looking over his leaves, point out the answers to what concerns me in it, which I have given already to the former Author.

His Book hath six Chapters. In the first (p. 1. ad 5.) he premises twenty Distinctions which may pass. In his second, he laies down as many Propositions, (p. 6. ad 20.) whereof three only require my animadversion.

Prop. 5. He cites learned Authors on both sides, some defining Ordination only to be a publick approbation and confirmation, and others a protestative mission, or collation of Office-power, and then tells us, we may call it either of these, provided, we will acknowledge it to have the force of a Condition, or *causa sine qua non* of that power. Unto which I have this to say, that if this person had bettowed as many thoughts to compound these two Opinions, and shew us how they may stand together, as he hath shewed kindness in granting both of them to us, he might both have saved himself some labour, and made us more beholding to him. See *ante*, p. 16. where you have this same thing pre-conceived by my self. There is his 14th. distinction therefore he hath laid down, as idle, and without use in him, that may take its place here, to wit, This Ministerial power may be considered *in foro Dei* (or *conscientia*) and *in foro humano*. They are his own terms, if he had but been so happy also to apply them. See *ante*, *Self*. 3. p. 30. In the first consideration (I have said there) a man hath this

Q

power,

power, and must have it before Orders, and so his first Argument (p. 11, 12.) from the Coronation of a King, and Elected Magistrate, will make for us, and shew him how *Investiture* follows the Office, and not given in. In the second consideration, we will acknowledge it, that ordinarily *extra casum necessitatis*, it come by Orders, and so his next two Arguments, (p. 13.) are answered, to wit, It is not enough that a man is qualified and desires the Office; But being Ordained, he becomes a Minister as he was not before. In this sense, be it granted him, that Orders is a Condition, as he would have it, which being put, Office-power does follow, and being denyed, is suspended, to wit, *coram hominibus*, as to the Church. And so that question which he asks, *Are all Prophets, are all Teachers?* is so far from posing of us, that we shall not need to answer him only, *And have all gifts?* although while the Apostle (1 Cor. 12. with Ro. 12.) makes the Gifts and Office to be Commensurate, that were enough; But we can say farther, when a man hath the Gift and spiritual Power from God, yet hath he not his right of Reception before Men, till his Orders. It is Orders, I will account my self, gives a person his Church-Authority, and transfers him *ab esse Laico, ab esse Clericale*, (if you will) *in her Court*. And this I hope does cut those in the hamm quite, that will be running before they be sent, to wit, before they be sent by the Church. And yet while *in foro Dei*, a man hath his Gifts and Office, and so is a Minister before, in that respect, this Gentleman I hope will stand to his word, that there is not then, so much *intrinsic* to the Ordinance, which may hinder its repetition. I pray let us suppose a pious, laborious, worthy Minister, that hath exercised the Ministry many years upon approbation only of an Assembly; I might instance in Mr. Bruce, (ante. p. 71.) or in one perhaps of eminent note for this particular, at home, not Ordained Presbyter till the Bishops now came in; Let me ask any sober-spirited man hereupon, whether such a ones Ministerial Acts for ten, a dozen years, or more past, were all *ipso facto*, null and void? and whether he believe really, that such a man could have no spiritual power derived to him from Christ, for that service, whereby there are so many probably have been edified? What maps heart could serve him to say this? The direct clear contrary vote whereunto, in Mr. Bruce his case, you have had before, and for my part

part, if I could once believe so, I might at next turn believe also, that the hands of a Bishop alone, laid on a mans head, shall fetch down the Holy Ghost (or this spiritual effect) upon him straight, when the hands and prayers of twenty Presbyters can do nothing. After which, I were forced to believe even what you would have next. And yet shall we leave open a gapp here, as may let in confusion thro the Ministry? No, there is a middle and right way to be taken, and that is (as I judge) what I have proposed in this Distinction thus applied, which I therefore humbly offer to the sober in heart to consider of, and as for his other Arguments that follow, (p. 14.) out of the *London Divines*, they are answered, *ante Sect. 5. p. 48.* to 51.

Prop. 8. and Prop. 15. Methinks, although it be true that the Bishop in his account does Ordain a man again to the Office, and will look on it as a proper Ordination, the man himself yet, may take it, having I will suppose, a call to a new place, as an Ordination to a particular work, or otherwise, as a regular confirmation only of his former Ministry, and so declare it resolutely, when he does it. Why may he not blend in practice, what this man distinguishes in notion? And as for the *Form* only, which is but mans composition, what if it be a little mis-used, so long as it will serve that turn in some sort we take it for, though it were framed indeed at first for another? Even as a Key we know sometimes will serve to open two or three Locks, when it was at first hammer'd out for one of them only.

His next Chapter contains twenty argumentative interrogations, unto which I will say in general, If the Office-power a Minister hath given him, *coram Ecclesia* by Orders, which is I count in it self, nothing else but the repute of us as Ministers, or reception in that relation, as we stand in before toward God, being called of him, be to be put in the predicament of Relation, that one axiome only, *Multiplicatis terminis, multiplicatur relatio*, may serve to unwind this Author out of many of those intricacies he hath thought good to writh himself in, in this third Chapter, See *ante, p. 17.* In particular I answer.

To the first, The case is the same as in the repetition of the Oath of Allegiance, to the Magistrate: *Ante, p. 37.* The swearing is specifically the same, to wit, the manner of the same Pre-

cept, and the repetition which makes it differ numerically only, is the command of our Superiours. Add to this that instance, 2 Ch. 30. 23. Say the same of it, and apply it to Orders.

To the Second, It is answered at large; *Ante*, Sec. 4. p. 36. &c.

To his Third, and Fifth, I would ask whether *Joseph* being Christ's reputed Father, was a Relation? If it were, I should answer what is hinted before: But to choose what I think, Ordination (I will say) adds no new being, nor begets any new Relation, but declares or testifies that to the Church which is already. As when a Couple have mutually given their consent, the conjugal Relation arises from thence before God, and if they be married after, both by the Magistrate, and Minister, it is but the same thing new declared, and that is all. And thus I remember among the Arguments *Votius* uses to prove, that *Ordinatio non est Fundamentum Ministerii*; he produces this for one, *Conjugii Fundamentum est mutui consensus non vero externa solemnizatio*; which he confirms out of the Lawyers.

To his Fourth, between, See *Ante* p. 90.

To his Sixth, Christ, I conceive, exerts not any Act in Ordination, as to collation of power (whatever he do, as to his Grace or Spirit) but the Charter of his Gospel only, or Institution, is his standing Act, and the Church declares a man in Office according to the same.

To his Seventh, Re-ordination is an injury indeed on the part of those that require it to the nullifying our former Ministry, but not, I hope, on the part of those that submit to it only for the use of that Ministry they cannot enjoy otherwise. Necessity excuses by the verdict of this mans own twelfth Proposition.

To the Eighth, We must conceive no otherwise of this investiture with Ministerial power in Orders, than of the investiture with Regal in the Inauguration of Princes, the repetition whereof (instanced by me in Scripture) does I hope, answer this Interrogation.

To the Ninth, and Tenth, The Deaconship, as well as the Priesthood in our Case is taken only we know by way of Form for the Canonical Stamp upon our former Ministry, and let a

man look to it only that he avoid lying in his own Answers, and I do judge, supposing him at present disposed, and under the need of it, that it is to be born by him, when he cannot help it, as a Christian bears affronts and indignities for the sake of the Gospel.

To the Eleventh, Necessity that knows no Law is not bounded by Number.

To the Twelfth, Our people are to be taught by us, to believe (as we do) that our former Orders are valid, which prevents these scruples.

To the Thirteenth, and Fourteenth, The arguing is pertinent, as to our Rulers, if they will please to hearken to it, but the Case of Imposition, is not the same with the Submission.

To the Fifteenth, This is prevented by the explication of our account of, and sense about our re-ordaining.

To the Sixteenth, what should hinder, but a man may pray in Faith for Gods Grace or Blessing upon his Office or Work more than once?

To the Seventeenth, I had thought to have found something against Prelacy in the Abstract, as Anti Christian, akin to the Papal Hierarchy, or the like, and so dangerous to be medled with at all, or to be come near in the least, but when that which is objected is personal only, I pray *Quorsum hac?* The validity of Orders, I hope, as of Baptism, depends not on the goodness of the Priett. *Luther*, and others of our first Reformers, never took any other than the Romish Orders.

To the Eighteenth, If Re-ordination be but proved *in the fi*, it is fair for me, for I will confess, that as it is cloathed with all its circumstances *in hypothesis* it is very hard to be digested, and this good man methinks should not go to make it harder, while he sits down so industriously, as it were, to prick thorns into his Brethrens hearts, that are herein too tender and bleed already. There are 27 Particulars raked up out of the words of the Bishop, or Arch-deacon, as incongruous in the Form, which let them look to that speak them: For my part, I care not to have it said, in regard of the change of the Churches Court from Presbytery to Episcopacy, that I am new Order'd; or Admitted, any more than for a M^r. of Arts in one University to be *admitted* M^r. also in the other. There are 20 other Particulars therefore he adds, which come more close, whereof
 211 Q 3 though

though some are much strained, and some concern those that come to be Ordained at first, as the Re-ordained, which is pity; Yet do I assent to him so far, that whatever words or engagements a man utters for himself, he hath need to be very tender of them, inasmuch that I my self find some kind of guilt reflected on me, methinks (I crave mercy) in one passage I thought not on in the least before, to wit, the first Question in the Deaconship is, *Do you think you are moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this Office and Administration?* I took this Casuistry as no more than, Do you think you have Gods Call to the Ministry? And the Answer being so gentle, *I think so*, it passed with me without more thought: A man may (I think) say he is moved by the Holy Ghost to his duty, and while he submits to this *Form* only, for the confirming his Ministry, I cannot deny but this may be said; yet let the words be strictly taken (as this man does urge them) of that Work and Office of the Deaconship, as distinct from the Priesthood, if I were put upon it now, I could hardly say it again without some explication. It must be conceived therefore, when the Bishop dispenses with the Canons, as to the Ordaining a man Deacon and Presbyter in one day, there is no expression necessary thereto, but he may dispense with likewise; And consequently, let every man be sure to crave his liberty accordingly, as to the variation of any such expression, which is against his Conscience, and that is the proper, clear, and full remedy in this matter. If possibly one Bishop should deny a man so poor a thing as this (which I conceive none will) let him go to another.

To the Nineteenth, I consent with full conviction, that it is wholesome and prudent advise, for a man that goes about this business, to consider first with himself well, how far his Conscience will go, and whether he can thereby attain his end by it, to wit, as the getting into, so the keeping his Ministry got, which if he can, with a satisfied heart, by a full conformity, or His Majesties gracious indulgence either, it is well; I shall be glad (however it be with my self) if my labour be not in vain in the Lord unto any.

To his Twentieth, I acknowledge the same as to the main; but crave the Application of his Thirteenth Distinction, and Proposition.

His Fourth Chapter contains Animadversions particularly upon my Tract, which he reduces to Ten Arguments.

Arg. 1. From *Pauls* using Circumcision, and the Jewish Rites, to which he speaks p. 66. and 73. *Ans.* I see not well to what end he shews his reading here, unless to confirm me more herein: It appears by the Authorities and Particulars he recites, that *Paul* and the Jews used those Rites after Christs death to another than their proper end; And if he so industriously grant the use of those Rites, which were the Ordinances of God, without that end to which they were at first appointed by him; Why does he make so much ado for us to use that *Form* which is only the Ordinance and Composure of men, to another end than that to which it was framed at first by them? See *Ans.* p. 44. And loe here the Apple of that strife (or parring of it) about which they contend.

Arg. 2. From the precedent of *Barnabas* and *Paul*, *Act.* 13. This he speaks to: p. 74. ad 82. *Ans.* The first instance of these hath methinks even non-plus'd this man: Orders is with him an Authoritative Mission; *Barnabas* now is sent forth Authoritatively by the Church at *Jerusalem*, yet Ordained here with *Paul* at *Antioch*; what sayes he to this? Why this only, *It might be judged an occasional Embassy.* But how I pray could he be sent by them on this Embassy without the Office? *The exercise of Authority supposes the Existence,* sayes he somewhere himself. And how could he have the Office according to him unless he was Ordained? Here then is a double Ordination by men: for, as for any immediate Ordination of *Barnabas* from Christ before, as of *Paul*, we read not; And this Person does hold, that a man cannot be a Minister, or have his Office, but by Orders: And yet does the fellow-instance with this take much deeper root in my Soul. *Paul* we are sure was call'd and sent by Christ himself immediately to the Gentiles, and yet Ordained after with *Barnabas*. Now if a man may be Ordained by men, who was Ordained before by Christ himself, how much rather I pray may he be Ordained again, that is Ordained only before by men? And thus doth that which he answers to weaken this, add strength to it; which is, *A twofold Ordination, one extraordinary, and the other ordinary. cannot justify a twofold Ordination that is ordinary.* But what is this opposing words to real things? It justifies it I say

say the rather. The call to the Ministry is either *Inward*, which lies in Gods gitting and inclining a person for the Office (as he speaks) or *Outward*. This call from *without*, we must know is either Extraordinary or Ordinary; which by the way may convince this Author of a farther defect in his apprehension, while he would make the Inward call in us, to answer that which was Extraordinary then. Well, Paul is called Extraordinarily by Christ, at first from without; *appearing to him on purpose that he might send him*, &c. and yet called again by Orders for all that. Here then is an *external call* we see double. What can he possibly say to this? Yes, What can he say to the bottom of the matter? The reason why Divines and he do hold the unlawfulness of Re-ordination, is because they conceive a man is made a Minister already by his first Orders; But here we have a Precedent for certain, that one who is a Minister already, may be Ordained. Our foot here is upon a Rock. Two thing he hath to answer; 1. *Some say this Ordination was to a higher Office*. But who saies so? When Christ had made Paul his Apostle, what Office I pray can be given by man after, higher than this? 2. *We deny* (he adds) *this to be a proper Ordination*. But though he does so, I do believe there is not so much as one of the Ancients can be produced to have dreamed of such a denial; and presuming that there is not 10 to 100 of all Divines else, that ever interpreted this place otherwise, than of Ordination, I may conclude (I hope) that Orders is and must be that, and nothing else but that, which is, or may be gathered of it here, rather than to say with this person, that that which is here, is not to be accounted Ordination. While therefore he endeavours to prove by several particulars, that these persons were not Ordained here to their Office, let us by *Ordaining to the Office*, understand what such learned men as are of his mind do, that is, Ordained for the conferring of their Office, *Ut Episcopalem gratiam largiretur*; He little thinks how he is pleading for me, who do hold this certainly to be true; and consequently, when Ordination does no more than what he allows it here to do, what is the repetition of it, to be so pleaded again, if occasion be? Let this Author therefore, that admits that I do not prove this Imposition of hands to be a proper Ordination, when it is generally received to be no otherwise than so, know, what is more material for him to prove if

to be argued from its own light, as *bonum est animal*, or *animal substantia* (yet not without convenient patronage, neither from Scripture, (*ante p. 74.*) and therefore the Arguments of this Author which he offers only from this particular place of *Act. 13.* might be waved as to him easily, by saying that, though this was not the end of that *liturgical dismissal* there, yet may it be the end always of every proper *Ordination*. But forasmuch as I do take that to be *Ordination*, and for ought I know, so full and proper, as proper can be, I shall choose to consider a little more, what we find there in that place. In the first place, we find manifestly a call of the Holy Ghost. This call, *separate me*, I can understand no otherwise than as I do the *Prophecy*, that *went before on Timothy*, to wit, to be by Revelation, to some of those Prophets and Teachers, there (for hence it is probable that they are told us to be Prophets, when it had been enough to say only they had been Teachers *et c.*) who being as it is said, *in the Church, and Ministering to the Lord*, we must conceive the Body of them met together with them, and when these Prophets and Teachers, to whom this was revealed, do in the midst of the Congregation, thus solemnly lay hands on these persons according to the spirits bidding of them, what can be more plain in the thing its self, than that this is an open testimony of that call or publick approbation in the face of that Church, which being the most famous than in Christendom, the notice of it, and consequently esteem of them accordingly, does necessarily follow upon the same. And what now are his several particulars against this, if any one were minded to set himself to answer the same?

Arg. 4th. and 5th. and 6th. Aparsi; From Marriages, from the Oathes of Allegiance and Supremacy, and from the Lords Prayer, whereof he speaks p. 91. ad 95. Ans. Here I perceive very good confirmation. *The formal Contract* (saies he) *which may be, and often is, before the Marriage, gives the relation.* Again, *The proper end is the satisfaction of the world, and therefore if the first solemnity give not satisfaction, a second may be, without profanation.* Just thus do I conceive of Orders; He hath spoken my parallel thoughts for me, as to Re-ordination. So likewise, for the other instance he is already foretalled. See *ante p. 56. 57.*

Arg. 7th. From Christs personal Baptism; This I urged in

in my Book, thus only, to wit, That an Ordinance may be used by a person who is not capable of its principal end, because there may be more ends than one of an Ordinance; and he may be capable of some other of them, though not that. Now what means here, these heapings of Commentators and particulars, to shew that there was some end for which Christ submitted to Baptism? Who ever was so impious to think otherwise? That I said, or say, is *John's Baptism in Scripture, is the Baptism of Repentance for remission of sin*; Christ is not capable of this end, yet baptized. What is there in these three leaves to contradict this, unless it be his first answer only, from *A Lapide* to wit, *Christus quasi remi & poenitent Johanni se fuisse* &c. But will indeed such Doctrine hold that Christ Jesus did repent as well as dye in our behalf? What if I should use here those words he hath upon me in the next page, about Re-baptization, *Ob hoc strong was the temptation that trapan'd so learned a person into Antinomianism*? But I dare not so ludicrously also add his Prayer.

Arg. 8. p. 101. ad 110. He produces ten interpretations of *Act. 19.* to wave that single instance of Re-baptization. That which I shall observe here, only is, how hard it is for a man to be well read in Books, and not sacrifice to them, to the spoil of his own judgment, and how the strength of a man is indeed weakness. There can be but one true meaning or interpretation of the Text; If any one then of these ten be true, the other nine are certainly false, and when he proposes all as probable, it follows necessarily, that it must be ren to one, whether that he takes be right or no. And as for that he hath chose, though he may be extolled that he hath said so much as to make it seem possible, yet while it is so much strained at the very sight, it is less probable than the last, and most anciently received of his interpretations. For my part, I hold it base, to forsake any truth because humane authority would face us down. There are to me here these four things to be held. 1. That these persons were baptized, and re-baptized, as the former Author more judiciously (from *Vossius*) as I els hield, hath acknowledged. 2. That both these Baptisms were in o Christ, and so one and the same so far as I say, to wit, as to the Author, matter, form, and main end, and yet not altogether the same so, but one was *John's Baptism*, and the other *Christ's*; that

they might be re-baptized. 3. That the reason of the doing must be gathered from the Text it self, and that intimateth, that these Disciples understood not their former Baptism, at least so as they ought, either they knew not that they were Baptized into Christ at all, or not sufficiently that Christ, into whom they were Baptized, seeing they were Baptized into him as to come, when he was dark to the World. Now Christ being come, and fully revealed, the Apostles instructs them more fully, and explicitly herein, and so baptizes them formally, as *Diodatus* speaks, and expressly in the Name of Christ Jesus. As happily it was upon higher instruction, it may be said, into an higher Form, but not into another School, or Church State, and so be strong for us, *Aut.* p. 90. Upon this account it follows, according to what I have said, that though the universal judgement of the Church stands good against Re-baptization now, yet was there a particular Reason once in the Church, why a person might be re-baptized. And this does serve my turn, that there is not that hainous dread in the nature of the thing it self; and yet so long as this particular reason could not endure any longer than the interval wherein Baptism was administr'd into Christ to come, which is now ceased, I am not Trapan'd into Re-baptization, as this man, *Non satis quidem ingenio valens*, does speak, but may disapprove of the same now together with the Catholick Church, as well as any other.

Arg. 9. From Christs own Re-ordaining his Apostles. To this he speaks p. 111. ad. 115. And this indeed I do stand upon, and have there fully already prevented all that I think can be oppos'd; and what he hath else may pass only for illustration. I suppose he himself will not expect I should add any more. See. p. 76. ad. 80.

Arg. 10. From the double *χρησμός* upon *Timothy*; mentioned in two Texts in the two Epistles; Upon which this Author hath spoken methinks so feely, gravely, and deliberately, that all I can say is, that he hath made me to believe something more probable of that which I took before as possible only. And as for the two Authorities of mine, he farther quotes here in the end. I have not the Books at hand (where I am) to examine them. This he discourses p. 116. ad. 122. Where he ends his Animadversions.

After all this, in both these Authors, there is the Objection of the

the Covenant, which though I would fain wave as extrinſical to Re-ordination it ſelf, & for my own part, being not concerned in it, yet does it ſtill recur to my mind, ſo that I doubt I ſhall hardly be found faithful to my Brethren in the Caſe, if I ſpeak not ſomething at leaſt to that alſo before I leave. Unto this therefore, it is conſiderable firſt, whether that which is ſaid ordinarily by the Presbyterian, that the Biſhop does not Ordain *quâ Presbiter*, but *quâ Presbyter* (See 1 Tim. 4. 14. expreſs with 2 Tim. 1. 6.) or *quâ President* at moſt of ~~the~~ Presbytery, is not only that which is true, but gives alſay alſo, to this matter? If it does not, or not what is ſufficient, yet taking this in however, let us know next There are ſome things which may be unlawful at one time to do, or to be done, and at another be unlawful to be omitted, and not done. Let me aſk a perſon every way elſe diſpoſed, whether he does not think it his duty to follow his Miniſtry, and unlawful for him to forſake the ſame, were it not for this only? If he thinks ſo, it follows, that though, ſo long as he could uſe his Miniſtry without Epiſcopal Orders, he might judge himſelf bound againſt taking of them; Yet now, when without theſe Orders he cannot uſe his Miniſtry (if the times prove indeed ſtill ſo hard) and ſo to reſuſe the ſame, is by conſequence, to do that which he judges, as to him, is ſin, to wit, the quitting the Miniſtry he is engaged in; Here if he thinks that he ſtands bound by his Covenant ſtill (ſuppoſing him ſatisfied of Re-ordination otherwiſe, for therefore do I put this Objection laſt when all elſe is done) he makes that ſacred Engagement, intended by him only to Piety, to become to him a Bond of Iniquity; in which caſe, I think all Divines are clear in their Solution. The matter of an Oath no doubt muſt be a thing lawful, if a thing then lawful to be done, or omitted before, become now unlawful, the matter of the Oath does ceaſe, and *ceſſante materia ceſſat obligatio*. I dare not tender this, but with all due ſerious caution, tenderness, and ſubmiſſion. Let the concern'd look more to it.

In his fifth Chapter he hath liberally propoſed his Conceſſions, which, above all he hath beſides, is worthy to be regarded: He will yield to Examination from 1 Pet. 3. 15. To the Biſhops Approbation upon the ſame. To a Licence from *Ab.* 21. 37; 39. To a Benediction from *Ab.* 20 32. To Impoſition of hands; as a Sign of conſent, *Levit.* 24. 14. And all

this, both upon a mans undertaking a new Charge, and also upon the dissolution of his legal title, in the same. May let me add his own words in the cloze, *There is nothing that I can devise about Re ordination in these, the Right Reverend Bishop can demand, but it shall be yielded, except only the formal investiture with Ministerial Power.* Lo here how frankly he deals with us! which cannot but bring to mind what the former Author hath yielded also before him; who in the fourth page of his Book, will first *like well of a Confirmation* of our first Orders, as being not *exactly Canonical.* And secondly, *Not dislike a second Ordination* *ἐπὶ τῷ ἐπίτῳ* by the Bishop, upon the remove of a man unto a new Charge: Upon which, if this fresh Author yields a little farther, it is not without the same Foundation; For if the Work, and Office, (or the Work of the Office in general, and a particular Charge) may be distinguished as to a new place; why not also as to the old, when it is necessary puts them upon the distinction, in either? These Concessions I take therefore from both, as to the main upon the matter, to be what I have contended for. I desire none to make use of me that have not need of me, as such more particularly have, who enter, or have entered a new place; And when any do it, I humbly lay this charge on them, that they look on this matter no otherwise but as a legal establishment, or the Canonical Stamp of allowance (as I have expressed it) of their former Vocation; which they may pardon the rather, because that Orders it self (as I account) considered aright, comes to nothing in the nature of it, otherwise than this. And as for this investiture with power as they call it, which does so stick, As I judge, with both these Authors, that it is in this point indeed the sum of our dispute does lye, and the bent of my discourse therefore hath been driven thereat: So am I perswaded, that what I have said, really, may satisfy the unpreoccupied in judgement. And I must add, that though there be some Circumstances about the ordering otherwise, which have been to me very sore, and do require care in the prevention, and good satisfaction, according to a mans temper before-hand; yet as to this particular meerly, it seems to me as I understand the same (and the words are not our part) to have so little hurt in it truly, that of all the rest I know of to molest, I could methinks be soonest satisfied in this. And if these Authors

do indeed stick at all the rest for the sake of this only, they are huge Conformists methinks I may say, that *stick at nothing*. However this be, while we see how tenderly these candid Brethren do offer towards Submission, in point of Conscience in the thing, there is all the reason in the world, that our Church Rulers, who have the same thoughts of this investiture as they, should come to composition with them. To this effect, this Author does spend his sixth and last Chapter, by way of Petition, and pathetical Considerations, to persuade to it, wherein therefore I have nothing to oppose, or answer, but to joyn heart and ink along with him. In the mean while, winding up the Controversie (or the Agreement rather) which is between us in this manner.

Re-ordination may be considered in the Imposition, or our Submission. For the Imposition, we agree, we are sorry for it, and dare not justify it. For the Submission, it is either *voluntary*, or merely in compliance with the Times, which appears injurious to our former Orders, and virtually to justify the imposing, and so we agree likewise. I dare not approve this, but so far rather, as I have been any wayes culpable, I repent it: Or upon necessity, so that a man cannot else have the use of his Ministry, and in this Case it is, I Rate Re-ordination. Here then finally Reordination is to be considered again in *Thesi*, or *Hypothesi*: In *thesi* my Adversaries do indeed come up to me (for this only investiture with power, they stick at, belongs to the Form, being words, not in the Presbyterian Orders) while thus much is granted, as you see before; so that I count I have performed the task I at first undertook, having put in this Clause [Provided a man may crave liberty, if it be clogged in any Circumstance against his Conscience] in my first Sheets. In *Hypothesi*, I am willing to come to them, and joyn thus far, that if we take the Form exactly in every Circumstance, and its appurtinances, it is hard to be swallowed, and certainly requires condescension, which if it may be obtained in general, in a new mould, it were best; if not, every individual person must consider well the whole matter for himself (which I charge him in the Lord, for the delivery of my own Soul, and his, carefully to do) and then to crave, or take his liberty in those things which are against his Conscience, or else forbear. And if any good men shall do
thus.

thus, with comfort to themselves, and people, so that as to the main they are satisfied, I shall not, I hope, have cause to repent of what I have written, nor these Brethren of mine, of their kind Concessions, for which I thank them, and cannot take my leave of them, without this due commendation. *In many things have these candid, pious and worthy Adversaries done virtuously, but in this, they have excelled them all.* To wit, that they have freely let so much shelter stand for me, while yet they have been beleaguering of me; I mean in such huge fair Proposals, towards an accommodation. *When thou besiegest a City, thou shalt not cut down the Trees that are for meat, by smiting thy Axe into them, for thou thy self mayest afterwards come to eat of them.*

SECTION XII.

I Have but one thing more therefore to do now, and that is, to fall, together with these Authors, at the feet of the present Governors of our Church, in the behalf of my Brethren, whose hearts cannot serve them for all what can I say, to yield to this business of Re-ordination, at least, as it is clogg'd with all its Circumstances. We must therefore humbly request, in the first place, according to the petition of others, as that which is most full & easy, that there may be a general confirmation for all sufficient men of the Orders that are pass'd. It hath pleas'd His Gracious Majesty, to shed many Royal Favours from his Golden Rays upon you, & if you shall vouchsafe this to us, we shall take it as an Act of Grace from you, which would, I am perswaded set you more right in the eyes of the Reformed Churches abroad, & also in the hearts of the people in this Nation. If this may not be obtained, I shall, in the 2d. place, make bold to renew the Proposal in my last Sheets, that for as much as I see by these sober Adversaries, that my Brethren would be content with thankfulness to submit to a new Imposition of hands by the Bishop, if it might be done only in such a form as were optative (as the one expresses it) not ordinative; You would but be pleas'd, that unto the Forms of ordering of Priests, & Deacons, there might be a new framed, as proper for Confirmation, by the Bishop, of such

who

who have been ordained by Presbyters only. This I do offer me- thinks with some confidence, as that which is not only moderate between both parties, but of standing use, as to such still as may come over to us from other Churches; and so conducing to, and not derogating from, the Episcopal Dignity. If neither of these will be granted, yet we hope at least for *Charles the Second*, and His Declaration sake, you will not deny to the reader all due regard in Circumstances, as in Expressions, Subscription, and otherwise, that those that are willing to come on, may come off with all fair, meer, and satisfying accommodation. I must confess, I am one of the meanest and unworthiest of my Brethren, to take such a petition into my mouth, in their behalf; but yet one whom the Lord hath called forth to be concerned in it more than any; and as I am a person more indifferent than others, not loosed from my own shell to study a Side, or be engaged to a Party, I may the rather speak the truth to you, as near as I can, in Righteousness.

It hath pleased God, that this thing, since I did it, hath filled my heart with many thoughts, and much trouble; And if I believe that Providence hath a hand in every thing that is going, I shall be worse than one of those *upon whom the Tower of Siloh fell*, if I should not be deeply sensible of the Case of my Brethren, whose Spirits are in doubt, and groaning under the perplexities of this, and the like Impositions; And therefore, after I have been put to so heavy a distress, to clear up my own relief, and have endeavoured (according to my remu- ny) to satisfy them, that if it be still imposed, their Consciences may not be wounded for want of satisfaction in the doing; so must I also apply my self to you from the Lord, and his hand upon me in it (which you must pardon therefore, and put accordingly upon his account) for that only sure, and proper remedy in the thing, which is, to prevent the wound quite, by removing the occasion. You may be happily loath to have any think that less than the Ministerial Function it self, is given by your hands in Orders; but be you assured, if you continue requiring Re-ordination in our Case, your honour here will but turn to a formality, and the truth will be sought out for our Apology.

It must be acknowledged by you, and by me, that this Re- ordination is ordinarily at least, if not quite against the hair

of the Literate World, whether Councils, School-men, or Fathers, in so much that I must needs be afraid, the Truth it self, were it not for the grand necessity put upon us else at this season, would hardly bear me out in the defence of it, so unusual, so unpleaded for by Divines Ancient and Modern, so absonant to the ears of your selves, that even you that require it, will not own it, but when you have done, would have us count our former Orders null, lest it be monstrous; And if any of us do defend the same, and are sure to be opposed by those that oppose you, yet unless we will come up to this (which is to acknowledge our selves Intruders, and Usurpers of the Ministry all the time before) we cannot for ought I see have any refuge in you, which is indeed so hard, and injurious (especially when our former Bishops have allowed what I assume) that I cannot but bring my complaint to you, and lay it at your doors. There are the Ceremonies I see with this you are bringing in upon us, tis a thousand pitties so many good men should be troubled with them, or at them methinks, as they are like to be, which I am not yet convinced, but they might be spared, or born perhaps (the scandal first prevented) as the water off ones Hat, or the hairs upon ones Cloaths, it was *ineptia tolerabilis*, therefore Calvin call'd them: Yet if these be stood upon, I count, the constant use of the same, or the like, or many more than them in the ancient Church, the moderate judgement of some of the eminent of our Reformed Divines abroad, the consent and practice of our holy Martyrs at home, and the long establishment thereof by Law in our Church, will put such a countenance upon them that they must needs bear their sail high, whether they can all of them endure the shock of that Text, *Deut. 12. 32.* in dispute or not. But for this matter of Re-ordination, it is such an odd thing, the very Sme&ymnus of the present Episcopacy, it will never turn to account (as one would think) unless to cast a reflection on you in the judgements of the Churches abroad, and Ages to come, unto whom the multitudes involved, and other circumstances considered, it will appear such a *Fall, quale nec Antiquitas vidit, & agre credent posteri*, the spectacle whereof, will not only, like *Amasa*, unless it be covered with a cloth, cause many to make a stand at your wayes, but like the offering of the King of *Moen* upon the wall, raise their Tents, and

and depart from you. And there was great indignation against Israel.

There are two ways now to cure this, either to cease this matter, or maintain it; if you will stand to it, that you Ordain, and Re-ordain, that it is not forbidden, but rather justifiable by the words of God, and that we are not to have our fear taught us by the Precept of men, it were something; but if you will impose it, and dis-own it, and be ashamed of it, and would have us nullifie our former Ministry to that purpose, to wit, to be contented to be held Usurpers of holy things, sacrilegious persons, and all our Ministerial Acts to be void, as the Acts of meer Laicks before, it is really intolerable, no mortal flesh can be pleased with it. Come, come, my Lords and Brethren, there is no need of this; The matter is not so much as you should be afraid of it; There is a time to begin a Custom, and to break an old. And why not? *Nun desunt leges, non desit Senatus-consultum, dico apparet, nos, nos, consules desumus.* There is not wanting the Scripture in the instances of Paul, and the Apostles, nor reason; there is wanting only a will in you to bestow an hours time or two to alter a few words in your Form, to suit it to our case, and the business might come to a perfect agreement.

One instance there is indeed from antiquity, often in the pens of the learned, it is out of *Athanasius*, of some persons with *Ischyas* amongst them, whom they would not allow (as they say) to be Ministers, because one *Coluthus* that Ordained them, only was a Presbyter; Unto which may be added the story of the purblind Bishop, 2 *Concil. Hispal.* 3. can. 5. circa an. 656. But Dr. *Field* upon the Church, in his fifth Book, hath mentioned this, and given by the by full satisfaction. It is one thing herein (he counts) what they judged according to their Canons, and what we ought to judge according to the Law of God; And so the Author of *Sami Conc.* quotes Pope *Inocent*, *Adversus formam Canonum ad Ordinem venire tentans ordine & honore privetur.* I believe they judged at this time, in this instance, according to their own constitutions, that a man must be Ordained by a Bishop; and so do you now according to yours, and therefore I plead for Re-ordination on the part of the Submitter; But on the part of the Requirer, that may dispense with their own Canons, or alter them, I must say, it is

not so in the reformed Churches, who have had more light since them of old. It is not so according to the Law of God, with that worthy Dr. mentioned. *Non usque ab initio*, with St. Jerome; and whether the Law of God or Canons of Men must take place, judge you. It is this we stand upon, when a man is in Orders, whether by Presbyters or Bishops, he is Christs Minister according to his Word, put in Office by him. You are personages now of quality, as of great learning, so of much honesty, and would not (we believe) do the least injury in your dealings unto any in other matters; Here now is a matter of as great and manifest wrong, as can be, which your opinion does us, and that opinion that does wrong, is a sinful opinion; to wit, it takes away that Office from a person which Christ hath given him, and holds it null. If it was a grievous thing in these times to put a Minister out of his Place, what is it to put a Minister out of his Office? A Thief is not more dangerous than such an opinion, which (believe it) shall be brought to the Bar one day, to answer unto Christ for what it does. There is no great Person, or Parliament men, that holds any honour from the King, if he hath an English spirit, but will venture his life, rather than lose his honour, while the King is pleased to continue it; And can you or they think, that we who have been Ordained Ministers of Christ, should so easily desert that Ministry as not valid, or not maintain it to be good? You may expect as well, we should deny the Lord that bought us, as the Lord that sent us, or recede from that authority which we received neither from you, nor the Presbytery, but from him only. We can rather dye here, than yield to any.

Men and Brethren, let me speak to you freely of the Patriarch David, of our Right Reverend Fore-fathers, your Predecessors, and the eminent Sons of our Church, who have defended the reformed Churches, and Presbyterial Ordination, and I must call each of you, with the whole Honourable, the present Parliament, to Record, who are men of spirit and righteousness; that this same matter be revised, as a point of the greatest Right or Wrong that can be in debate; wherein it is not only we, that are concern'd, but Christ, our Master and Lord, (*Who rejecteth you, rejecteth me*) together with the Souls of his people; *And what have these Sheep done?* If therefore there does pass any Act that we in our case shall be forced to be Re-
ordained.

ordained, we do hope that you also shall be enjoy'd to frame such a form, or alter this so, as that the Prerogative of Christ be not touched, nor our former Ministry, or the reformed Churches flur'd, and then it may be happily well enough in this matter.

And alas indeed ! what shall we make of all those who cannot submit to be Re-ordained otherwise ? Shall they be Jews or Samaritanes ? Ministers or not ? I know not how they may look on the Ministry, that have greatness, wealth, and honour, tumbling in upon them with it ; but as for others, that desire or expect only to get their bread and raiment by it, and are intent upon the work, their business, and their account, which makes them groan under the weight, with a *who is sufficient for these things* ? If I know any thing of flesh and blood, there cannot be a thought almost more pleasing to it, than to conceive, that if the times will now destroy their former Orders, or not let them pass, then may they look on Providence as giving them a discharge from their labour ; and consequently that there can hardly be a piece of self-denial more close, than for a man sincerely upon that account, to tie up himself by this taking new (when he is willing to be free) as the likeliest way to set his mind at quiet from that temptation, and force himself upon his work, if his heart be indeed fully up, and without flaw, even with this ; And will your honours now I pray, conspire with the flesh and blood of sinful man, that because some persons will not submit to you in this thing, you will find a means how to gratifie the same to the full ? Truly, if you were indeed able to take away a mans Office, as easily as you may his Place, it would be giving them such a play day, that it cannot be said how many would gladly accept thereof ; But when the Office remains indelible, As I must tell them, that supposing this be so, that their Orders will pass, though they may look on Providence thereby to dispense with them for all that which they may not do in their calling without new Orders, if their Conscience cannot submit to them (for if it can, they know what they have to do) yet will it not dispense with them, or acquit them from any thing they can do, only upon their old, and there is no doubt but much still may be done, and will be permitted to any Ministers that are peaceable, and able in this case. So must I tell you,

that this is a better way to punish such for their non-submission, than to pleasure their flesh for it; Let them be held still for Labourers in the Vineyard, that the Mr. may not be offended with you who hath employed them, nor their Talents be wrapt up in a Napkin, or the people be deprived of their pains, though it be only by permission, as assistants to others for the good of the Church, and help of them, when the *Tales* themselves, with Institution and Induction are bestowed, only according to the Law of the Land. This is that will satisfy those that are truly pious at the heart, and stick hereat only upon Conscience; For let them but glorifie God, and save mens Souls, and they have their main end, being desirous to do Gods work with a little, and leave their wages with him; And this will also best fetch in others, who when they refuse only out of obstinacy, or unsound ends, they will soon grow weary, while they see (as I am speaking) they shall have work as they are Ministers of Christ, but preferment only as Ministers according to the constitution of the Nation.

Though this be hard, I heartily wish it may not be worse, but humbly hope and crave it may be better. And having now taken upon me to speak to your Honours, I must importune you yet farther in the Name of the Lord, more in general than about this thing only, to wit, for the multitudes of his Servants, who have their faces towards Sion, in a way of different persuasions. Let not my Lords think it to be merely pride, and humour design and faction, perverseness and obstinacy, or fanaticism altogether, but rather in many a serious Spirit, a zeal of God, a care of their Souls, a breathing after purity, at least *Epistatus* his *Edofoev* *Edofoev* as to every one of them; And therefore suffer a plain man, only from his own heart, to beseech you, in the Name of the Almighty, the God of you, and me, and them, if there be any bowels, if there be any candour, if there be any sense of the hatches you were your selves under but lately, that you put forth your interest which God hath given you at the Helm (it may be to some of you for such a time as this) to preserve what indulgence you can for all tender Consciences (as Gods Sovereignty) so far as ever it can stand with the promotion of sober holiness, necessary government, and due order.

It was the prudence of *Themistocles*, as I remember, to
connel

to unseat *Greece* to let the *Perſians* have their Bridge unplucked down; it would be yours I am perſwaded here, to let the ſubject of other Parties have a Bridge made for them, that when they would they might come honourably over to you, as it was for them to let their enemies have their Bridge, that when they would they might be gon again from them. Alas, what were the parting with a Ceremony or two for *Englands* peace? What were it when you have all that Money and Dignity can yield you, and are ſharing it amongst you, to leave others poor Conſcience for their part? Let them but ſee a countenance of hearty Piety above Ceremony, of Grace above Prophaneneſs, and that you let Gods Children alone in thoſe things wherein they do you no hurt, it will bring them very near to you. Oh that men were brought to this paſs, that they were heartily willing to let their Brethren come in, and be one with them! It is pity certainly, that any Spirits ſhould be ſuch, that the ſame things will not content them ſometimes, with the good leave and complacency of their Brethren, unleſs they may have them in ſpite and oppoſition; And why ſhould any uſe violence, where more may be wonn with courteſie? Then *Abner* called to *Joab*; and ſaid, *ſhall the Sword devour for ever? Knoweſt thou not it will be bitterneſs in the end? How long ſhall it be ere thou bid the people return from following of their Brethren?*

And now methinks there lies before you, O you Rulers, many thouſands at your feet crying quarter, quarter for our Souls, quarter for our Conſciences; we are not able to ſubmit to ſome of theſe Impoſitions: Though the things may be lawful, yet ſo long as they are againſt their Conſciences, it is ſin to them, and they cannot do them but they wound their Souls. *He that doth them and doubteth is damn'd if he do them.* O for Gods ſake! take heed, do not ſhove, do not preſs them upon damnation. If the Chriſtian that only by his example, gives occaſion to another to do the ſame thing he does, before his Conſcience be ſatisfied, ſhall judge himſelf that he hath ſinned, and dare not do the ſame again, leſt the wrath of God be kindled; what ſhall we think of ſuch (if there be any ſuch) that are ready to provide all ſeverity and rigor to force mens Conſciences, which for to do were the higheſt of ſcandal? And if it be better to have a Millſtone about ones neck, and be hurled into the bottom of the Sea, than to offend one of Gods

(127)
little ones; what is it to offend thousands, and ten thousands? I profess to God, if I were a great person, I should not think I ought to be more careful in the taking away a mans life in judgement, than in passing such Impositions, that may enslave mens Consciences; and if I should indulge my self otherwise, and think to find a way to engage the Lord towards me in his tender mercies, I should think this were like to be the best; to be pitiful to his Children, in having regard to their grieved Consciences. *He shall have judgement without mercy, that hath shewed no mercy.* If the tender Christian himself, that by temptation from without does feel one scolding drop of Gods wrath to be so hot, when he shall but yield to the most small thing against his Conscience, what shall those Rivers of Brimstone be hereafter, for those that drive men forward, and make no Conscience, though men do sin against their Consciences? If innocent blood does cry so loud from Earth to Heaven for vengeance, what shall the blood of mens Souls? O Sirs! You will not, you will not, I hope, seek the blood of mens Consciences. It must be a very hard thing for an honest man, and good subject, to be put upon it, to lose all that he hath for a Ceremony; And yet as that Ancient said to the Child that ask'd him why he chod him for so little a matter, *Customa* (saies he) *is no litle matter*; So say I, Conscience is a great matter, when the thing is litle for which a man suffers. Not that I would indulge my self in such scruples, or that while Charity hopeth all things, and believeth all things, and as some yet have compassion, this should hinder the making difference between a Scruple of Reason and Affliction, and the Refractoriness of Faction. *Will the Unicorn be willing to serve thee, or abide by thy Crib?*

I pray God to encline you all to those waies of Prudence, Humility, and Charity, that if it be possible, you may win the hearts of good men to you, who like the Disciples that were amazed when they heard of *Saul* in the Synagogue, *Is this he that destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem?* may begin as it were every where, to wonder at themselves, and at one another, how they came to be filled with former prejudice and mis-apprehension, as if with a change of the times, and a rast of Affliction, your Character was changed; and thus the Bishop turn'd *Titus* the Emperor, *Novum in se triforme demittere.*

Now

*Now the God of Peace, that brought again from the dead
our Lord Jesus, that great Shepheard of the Sheep, through
the blood of the everlasting Covenant, make you perfect in
every good work, to do his Will, working in you that which
is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom
be Glory for ever.*

FINIS.

T

ERRATA

ERRATA.

PAge 8. l. 8. for sic, r. fitly disposed. p. 26. l. 28. for on, r. upon. p. 32. l. 40. r. declared. p. 55. l. 37. put in the space 20. p. 75. l. 19. make the full point a comma. p. 82. l. 22. blot out *we*, and transpose *they* in its place. p. 86. l. 40. insert *ut vis* p. 98. l. 31. r. convinced. *ib.* l. 34. insert pardon the words. p. 99. l. 27. for must, r. may. *ib.* l. 32. for frequent, r. fervent. p. 103. l. 15. for too, r. so. p. 105. l. 35. r. *propriè*. p. 106. l. 19. r. *adverterant*. *ib.* l. 22. r. *venum*. p. 107. l. 24. r. *varies*. p. 109. l. 11. r. *exploratum*. p. 111. l. 3. r. *quibusdam*. p. 114. l. 21. for the second *ab*, put *ad*. p. 115. l. 3. r. down. p. 126. l. 35. for the second and, r. or. p. 136. l. 40. r. *dimittere*. Being upon review of these, with some other literal escapes, I am informed by Letter, concerning the Party whom I mention p. 35. to have been Re-ordained by Bishop *Davenant*, that he had received only *Licentiam in ordine inceptorum* in the Low Countries, which the Bishop indeed taking for compleat Ordination, did yet ingenuously tell him for all that, that he cared not, to have him O-*rdined more apud nos recepto*, were it not others might except. But when the Party certified him hereupon, about the way of these Churches, and that this went not with them for the *Ordo presbiterum Pastorum*, he was better satisfied; so that this Party avertes, he was but Ordained, not Re-ordained, and desires to have it divulged, lest more be led by his example. It is the Reverend and Learned Mr. *William Bailie*.

